arXiv:1702.03870v3 [math.CA] 1 Mar 2017

WEIGHTED INEQUALITIES FOR PRODUCT FRACTIONAL INTEGRALS

ERIC SAWYER AND ZIPENG WANG

ABSTRACT. We investigate one and two weight norm inequalities for product fractional integrals

$$I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f(x,y) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} |x-u|^{\alpha-m} |y-t|^{\beta-n} f(u,t)\, dudt$$

in $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$. We show that in the one weight case, most of the 1-parameter theory carries over to the 2-parameter setting - the one weight inequality

$$\left\| \left(I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f \right) w \right\|_{L^q} \leq N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,m),(\beta,n)} \|fw\|_{L^p}, \qquad f \geq 0,$$

is equivalent to finiteness of the rectangle characteristic

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(w) = \sup_{I,J} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1} |J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} \left(\iint_{I\times J} w^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\iint_{I\times J} w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}},$$

which is in turn equivalent to the diagonal and balanced equalities

$$0 < \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}.$$

Moreover, the optimal power of the characteristic that bounds the norm is $2 + 2\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q}, \frac{q}{p'}\right\}$.

However, in the two weight case, apart from the trivial case of product weights, we show that virtually *none* of the standard results carry over from the 1-parameter setting - the two-tailed characteristic

$$\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) = \sup_{I,J} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1} |J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} \times \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} (\widehat{s}_{I\times J} w)^q \, d\omega \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\widehat{s}_{I\times J} v^{-1}\right)^{p'} d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}$$

fails to control the operator norm of $I_{\alpha,\beta} : L^p(v^p) \to L^q(w^q)$ in general, and even when both weights $v^{-p'}$ and w^q satisfy the rectangle A_1 condition in the case of strictly subbalanced diagonal indices $0 < \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}$. And finally, not even the rectangle testing conditions are sufficient for the two weight inequality when both weights satisfy the rectangle A_1 condition. Nevertheless, the Stein-Weiss extension of the classical Hardy - Littlewood - Sobolev inequality to power weights carries over to the 2-parameter setting with *nonproduct* power weights using a 'sandwiching' technique, providing our main positive result in two weight 2-parameter theory.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
2. 1-parameter theory 4
3. 2-parameter theory 6
4. Statements of problems and theorems, and simple proofs 8
4.1. A one weight theorem 9
4.2. Two weight theorems - counterexamples 10
4.3. Two weight theorems - power weights 12
4.4. Two weight theorems - $T1$ or testing conditions 13
5. Iterated operators 14
5.1. One weight inequalities for iterated operators 16
5.2. Proof of Theorem 5 18
5.3. Two weight inequalities for product weights 18
6. Proof of Theorem 6 20

7. Proof of Theorem 7 21
7.1. Product $A_1 \times A_1$ and product reverse doubling exponents 22
7.2. The Muckenhoupt characteristics 22
7.3. Failure of the strong type inequality for $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}$ 32
8. Proof of Theorems 8 and 9 34
8.1. Proof of Theorem 8 34
8.2. Strict inequalities 43
8.3. Necessity of the two-tailed condition for power weights 45
8.4. Proof of Theorem 9 45
9. Proof of Theorem 10 57
10. Appendix 61
10.1. Sharpness in the Muckenhoupt-Wheeden theorem 61
10.2. Sharpness in the Stein-Weiss theorem 61
10.3. Optimal powers of Muckenhoupt characteristics 62
10.4. Doubling, reverse doubling and Muckenhoupt type conditions 65
10.5. The product fractional integral, the Dirac mass and a modified example 68
References 70

1. Introduction

The theory of weighted norm inequalities for product operators, i.e. those operators commuting with a multiparameter family of dilations, has seen little progress since the pioneering work of Robert Fefferman [Fef] in the 1980's involving covering lemmas for collections of rectangles. The purpose of the present paper is to settle some of the basic questions arising in the weighted theory for the special case of product *fractional* integrals, in particular the relationship between their norm inequalities and their associated characteristics, two-tailed characteristics, and testing conditions. Our two main results are:

- The construction of a family of counterexamples to two weight inequalities for product fractional integrals, spoiling any chance that the familiar conditions based on characteristics and $T1$ type testing conditions - that play such an important role in characterizing two weight theory in one parameter - can play an analogous role in the multiparameter setting, and perhaps helping to explain the lack of progress in this area since the 1980's.
- A sharp one-weight theorem and a sharp product version of the Stein-Weiss extension of the classical Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev theorem for (nonproduct) power weights, which we establish by a (somewhat complicated) method of iteration, something traditionally thought unlikely.

The family of counterexamples in two weight theory requires a delicate construction of rectangle $A_1 \times A_1$ weights with 'nodes' carefully arranged on a hyperbola. Our positive results for one weight theory and two power weight theory are obtained using the tools of iteration, Minkowski's inequality and a sandwiching argument. In fact, it seems to be the case that all of the positive results in weighted product theory to date can be obtained using these three tools. Now we begin to describe these matters in detail.

Let $m, n \geq 1$. For indices $1 < p, q < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha < m$ and $0 < \beta < n$, we consider the weighted norm inequality

$$\left\{ \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f(x,y)^q \ w(x,y)^q \ dxdy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) \left\{ \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} f(u,t)^p \ v(u,t)^p \ dudt \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for the product fractional integral

$$I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f(x,y) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} |x-u|^{\alpha-m} |y-t|^{\beta-n} f(u,t) \, dudt, \qquad (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and characterize when one weight and two weight inequalities are equivalent to the corresponding product fractional Muckenhoupt characteristic,

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) \equiv \sup_{I\subset\mathbb{R}^m,\ J\subset\mathbb{R}^n} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J} w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I\times J} v^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \tag{1.1}$$

and its two-tailed variant,

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{(m,n),(\alpha,\beta)}(v,w) \\ &\equiv \sup_{I\times J\subset\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}(\widehat{s}_{I\times J}w)^q\,d\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\widehat{s}_{I\times J}v^{-1}\right)^{p'}d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}},\end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y) \equiv \left(1+\frac{|x-c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{\alpha-m}\left(1+\frac{|y-c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\beta-n}. \tag{1.3}$$

For the *one weight* inequality when $v=w$ and $p\le q$, we show that the indices must be balanced and diagonal,

$$\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}=\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n},$$

and that the finiteness of the operator norm $N_{p,q}^{(m,n)}(w)$ is then equivalent to finiteness of the characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(m,n)}(w)$, where as is conventional, we are suppressing redundant indices in the one weight diagonal balanced case. In addition, we characterize the optimal power of the characteristic that controls the operator norm. These one weight results are proved by an iteration strategy using Minkowski's inequality that also yields two weight results for the special case of *product weights*.

For the general two weight case, we show that in the absence of any side conditions on the weight pair (v,w), the operator norm $N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ is *never* controlled by the two-tailed characteristic $\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{(m,n),(\alpha,\beta)}(v,w)$, not even the weak type operator norm of the much smaller dyadic fractional maximal function $M_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}$ (see below for definitions). On the other hand, new two weight results can be obtained from known norm inequalities, such as the one weight and product weight results mentioned above, by the technique of 'sandwiching'.

Lemma 1. *If $\left\{\left(V^i,W^i\right)\right\}_{i=1}^N$ is a sequence of weight pairs 'sandwiched' in a weight pair (v,w), i.e.*

$$\frac{w(x,y)}{v(u,t)} \le \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{W^i(x,y)}{V^i(u,t)},$$

then[1]

$$N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) \le \sum_{i=1}^N N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(V^i,W^i\right).$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the identity,

$$N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(V,W) = \sup_{\|g\|_{L^p}\le 1,\|h\|_{L^{q'}}\le 1}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} g(x,y)\,W(x,y)\,|x-u|^{\alpha-m}\,|y-t|^{\beta-n}\,\frac{h(u,t)}{V(u,t)}dxdydudt.$$

□

We mention two simple examples of sandwiching, the first example sandwiching a one weight pair, and the second example sandwiching two product weight pairs:

(1) In the case of diagonal and balanced indices $\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}=\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n}$, if there is a *one weight* pair (u,u) with $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(u)<\infty$ sandwiched in (v,w), then $N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\lesssim A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(u)<\infty$.

[1]In the case $N=1$, the hypothesis is implied by $w\le W^1$ and $V^1\le v$, hence the terminology 'sandwiched'.

(2) If $w(x,y) = |(x,y)|^{-\gamma}$ and $v(x,y) = |(x,y)|^{\delta}$ are power weights on $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$, then $N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) < \infty$ provided the indices satisfy product conditions corresponding to those of the Stein-Weiss theorem in 1-parameter (see below), that in turn generalize the classical Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality. In this example there are two weight pairs $\{(V,W),(V',W')\}$ depending on the indices and sandwiched in (v,w) where each weight is an appropriate product power weight.

These two results are close to being the only possible positive results in the two weight setting. Indeed, we exhibit examples that show that even if *both* weights satisfy the product $A_1 \times A_1$ condition, the operator norm $N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ still cannot be controlled by $\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ when $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}$. Moreover, under these conditions, not even the testing conditions, where the norm inequality and its dual are tested over rectangles times w^q and $v^{-p'}$ respectively, are sufficient for the weighted norm inequality to hold.

Problem 1. *A basic open problem remains - that of finding a new type of condition to characterize the two weight norm inequality for product fractional integrals, given that all of the traditional candidates fail.*

Thus we see that the two weight product situation turns out to have striking differences from that of the 1-parameter theory, and to highlight this, we begin by briefly recalling the 1-parameter weighted theory of fractional integrals.

2. 1-parameter theory

Define $\Omega_\alpha^m(x) = |x|^{\alpha-m}$ and set $I_\alpha^m g = \Omega_\alpha^m * g$. The following one weight theorem for fractional integrals is due to Muckenhoupt and Wheeden.

Theorem 1. *Let $0 < \alpha < m$. Suppose $1 < p < q < \infty$ and*

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha}{m}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $w(x)$ be a nonnegative weight on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m f(x)^q \ w(x)^q \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}(w) \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x)^p \ w(x)^p \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for all $f \geq 0$ for $N_{p,q}(w) < \infty$ if and only if

$$A_{p,q}(w) \equiv \sup_{cubes\ I \subset \mathbb{R}^m} \left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w(x)^q \ dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w(x)^{-p'} \ dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} < \infty. \tag{2.2}$$

In fact, assuming only that $1 < p, q < \infty$, the balanced condition (2.1) is *necessary* for the norm inequality (2.2). See Theorem 13 in the Appendix for this.

A two weight analogue for $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ was later obtained by Sawyer [Saw] that involved testing the norm inequality and its dual over indicators of cubes times w^q and $v^{-p'}$ respectively, namely for all cubes $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m\left(\mathbf{1}_Q v^{-p'}\right)(x)^q \ w(x)^q \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} &\leq T_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(v,w) \ |Q|_{v^{-p'}}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \\
\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m\left(\mathbf{1}_Q w^q\right)(x)^{p'} \ v(x)^{-p'} \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{p'}} &\leq T_{q',p'}^{\alpha,m}\left(\frac{1}{w},\frac{1}{v}\right) \ |Q|_{w^q}^{\frac{1}{q'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Later yet, it was shown by Sawyer and Wheeden [SaWh], using an idea of Kokilashvili and Gabidzashvili [KoGa], that in the special case $p < q$, the testing conditions could be replaced with a two-tailed two weight version of the $A_{p,q}$ condition (2.2):

$$\sup_{I \subset \mathbb{R}^m} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}\left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I \left[\widehat{s}_I(x)\, w(x)\right]^q \ dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I \left[\widehat{s}_I(x)\, v(x)^{-1}\right]^{p'} \ dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \equiv \widehat{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(v,w) < \infty, \tag{2.3}$$

where the tail $\widehat{s}_I$ is given by

$$\widehat{s}_I(x) \equiv \left(1 + \frac{|x - c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{\alpha-m},$$

and c_I is the center of the cube I. Note that in Sawyer and Wheeden [SaWh], this condition was written in terms of the rescaled tail $s_I = |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1} \widehat{s}_I$, and it was also shown that the two-tailed condition $\widehat{A}_{p,q}$ condition (2.3) could be replaced by a pair of corresponding one-tailed conditions.

Theorem 2. *Suppose $1 < p < q < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha < m$. Let $w(x)$ and $v(x)$ be a pair of nonnegative weights on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then*

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m f(x)^q \ w(x)^q \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(v,w) \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x)^p \ v(x)^p \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{2.4}$$

for all $f \geq 0$ if and only if the $\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}$ condition (2.3) holds, i.e. $\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(v,w) < \infty$. Moreover, the best constant $N_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w,v)$ in (2.4) is comparable to $\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w,v)$.

The special case of power weights $|x|^\gamma$ had been considered much earlier, and culminated in the following 1958 theorem of Stein and Weiss [StWe2].

Theorem 3. *Let $w_\gamma(x) = |x|^{-\gamma}$ and $v_\delta(x) = |x|^\delta$ be a pair of nonnegative power weights on $\mathbb{R}^m$ with $-\infty < \gamma, \delta < \infty$. Suppose $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the strict constraint inequalities,*

$$0 < \alpha < m \text{ and } q\gamma < m \text{ and } p'\delta < m, \tag{2.5}$$

together with the inequality

$$\gamma + \delta \geq 0,$$

and the power weight equality,

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha - (\gamma + \delta)}{m}.$$

Then (2.4) holds, i.e.

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m f(x)^q \ |x|^{-\gamma q} \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w_\gamma, v_\delta) \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x)^p \ |x|^{\delta p} \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The previous theorem cannot be improved when the weights are restricted to power weights. Indeed, $\alpha > 0$ follows from the local integrability of the kernel, both $q\gamma < m$ and $p'\delta < m$ follow from the local integrability of w^q and $v^{-p'}$, and then both $\gamma + \delta \geq 0$ and $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha-(\gamma+\delta)}{m}$ follow from the finiteness of the Muckenhoupt condition $A_{p,q}(v,w)$ using standard arguments (see e.g. the proof of Theorem 8 below). These conditions then yield

$$\alpha = m\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) + \gamma + \delta < m\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'} = m.$$

A routine calculation shows that the aforementioned conditions on the indices $\alpha, m, \gamma, \delta, p, q$ are precisely those for which the characteristic $A_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w_\gamma, v_\delta)$ is finite. Finally, the necessity of the remaining condition $p \leq q$ is an easy consequence of Maz'ja's characterization [Maz] of the Hardy inequality for $q < p$. See Theorem 14 in the Appendix for this. Altogether, this establishes the succinct conclusion that the power weight norm inequality holds if and only if $p \leq q$ and the characteristic is finite.

Next, in the one weight setting, we recall the solution to the 'power of the characteristic' problem for fractional integrals due to Lacey, Moen, Perez and Torres in [LaMoPeTo]. See the Appendix for a different proof of this 1-parameter theorem that reveals the origin of the number $1 + \max\left\{\frac{p'}{q}, \frac{q}{p'}\right\}$ to be the optimal exponent in the inequality $\overline{A}_{p,q}(w) \leq A_{p,q}(w)^{1+\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q}, \frac{q}{p'}\right\}}$ where $\overline{A}_{p,q}(w)$ is a one-tailed version of $A_{p,q}(w)$.

Theorem 4. *Let $0 < \alpha < m$. Suppose $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and*

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha}{m}.$$

Let $w(x)$ be a nonnegative weight on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m f(x)^q \ w(x)^q \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}(w) \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x)^p \ w(x)^p \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

where

$$N_{p,q}(w) \leq C_{p,q,n}\ A_{p,q}(w)^{1+\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q},\frac{q}{p'}\right\}}.$$

The power $1+\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q},\frac{q}{p'}\right\}$ *is sharp, even when* w *is restricted to power weights* $w(x)=|x|^{\gamma}$.

Finally we recall the extremely simple proof of the equivalence of the dyadic characteristic $A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\mathrm{dy}}(\sigma,\omega)$, where the supremum is taken over dyadic cybes, and the weak type (p,q) operator norm of the dyadic fractional maximal operator M_{α}^{dy} with respect to (σ,ω). This proof illustrates the power of an effective covering lemma for weights, something that is sorely lacking in the 2-parameter setting, and accounts for much of the negative nature of our results (c.f. Example 1 below). Recall that the 1-parameter dyadic fractional maximal operator M_{α}^{dy} acts on a signed measure μ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$M_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}\mu(x) \equiv \sup_{Q\ \mathrm{dyadic}} |Q|^{\alpha-n}\int_Q d|\mu|\ .$$

Lemma 2. *Let* (σ,ω) *be a locally finite weight pair in* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, and let* $1<p\leq q<\infty$*. Then* $M_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}:L^p(\sigma)\to L^{q,\infty}(\omega)$ *if and only if* $A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\mathrm{dy}}(\sigma,\omega)<\infty$.

Proof. Fix $\lambda>0$ and $f\geq 0$ bounded with compact support. Let $\Omega_\lambda\equiv\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n : M_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}f\sigma>\lambda\right\}$. Then

$$\Omega_\lambda=\dot{\bigcup_k} Q_k\ ,\qquad |Q_k|^{\alpha-n}\int_{Q_k} f d\sigma>\lambda,$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\lambda\left|\Omega_\lambda\right|_\omega^{\frac{1}{q}}\right)^p &= \lambda^p\left(\sum_k |Q_k|_\omega\right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \leq \lambda^p\sum_k |Q_k|_\omega^{\frac{p}{q}} = \sum_k \lambda^p |Q_k|_\omega^{\frac{p}{q}}\\
&< \sum_k\left(|Q_k|^{\alpha-n}\int_{Q_k} f d\sigma\right)^p |Q_k|_\omega^{\frac{p}{q}} = \sum_k\left(|Q_k|^{\alpha-n}|Q_k|_\sigma^{\frac{1}{p'}}|Q_k|_\omega^{\frac{1}{q}}\right)^p |Q_k|_\sigma^{1-p}\int_{Q_k} f d\sigma\\
&\leq \sum_k\left(A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\mathrm{dy}}(\sigma,\omega)\right)^p\int_{Q_k} f^p d\sigma \leq A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\mathrm{dy}}(\sigma,\omega)^p\|f\|_{L^p(\sigma)}^p\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|M_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}f\right\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\omega)} &= \sup_{\lambda>0}\lambda\left|\Omega_\lambda\right|_\omega^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\mathrm{dy}}(\sigma,\omega)\|f\|_{L^p(\sigma)}\ ,\\
\text{for all } f &\geq 0 \text{ bounded with compact support.}
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the converse statement is standard, similar to but easier than that of Lemma 3 below. □

3. 2-parameter theory

Define the product fractional integral $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$ on $\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n$ by the convolution formula $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}f\equiv\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}*f$, where the convolution kernel $\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$ is a product function:

$$\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(x,y)=|x|^{\alpha-m}|y|^{\beta-n},\qquad (x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let $v(x,y)$ and $w(x,y)$ be positive weights on $\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n$. For $1<p,q<\infty$ and $0<\alpha<m$, $0<\beta<n$, we consider the two weight norm inequality for nonnegative functions $f(x,y)$:

(3.1)
$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}f(x,y)^q\ w(x,y)^q\ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,y)^p\ v(x,y)^p\ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

If we define absolutely continuous measures σ,ω by

$$d\sigma(x,y)=v(x,y)^{-p'}\,dxdy \text{ and } d\omega(x,y)=w(x,y)^q\,dxdy, \tag{3.2}$$

then the two weight norm inequality (3.1) is equivalent to the norm inequality

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(f\sigma)(x,y)^q\ d\omega(x,y)\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,y)^p\ d\sigma(x,y)\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{3.3}$$

where now the measure σ appears inside the argument of $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$, namely in $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(f\sigma)$. In this form, the norm inequality makes sense for arbitrary locally finite Borel measures σ,ω since for nonnegative $f\in L^p(\sigma)$, the function f is measurable with respect to σ and the integral $\int \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(x-u,y-t)\,f(u,t)\,d\sigma(u,t)$ exists. Note also that the best constants $N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n),}(v,w)$ and $\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n),}(\sigma,\omega)$ coincide under the standard identifications in (3.2), and this accounts for the use of fraktur font to differentiate the two best constants.

A necessary condition for (3.3) to hold is the finiteness of the corresponding product fractional characteristic $\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,m),(\beta,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ of the weights,

$$\begin{aligned}(3.4)\qquad \mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega) &\equiv \sup_{I\subset\mathbb{R}^m,\ J\subset\mathbb{R}^n} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}}\left(\frac{|I\times J|_\omega}{|I\times J|}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{|I\times J|_\sigma}{|I\times J|}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\ &= \sup_{I\subset\mathbb{R}^m,\ J\subset\mathbb{R}^n} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J} d\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I\times J} d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}},\end{aligned}$$

as well as the finiteness of the larger two-tailed characteristic,

$$\begin{aligned}(3.5)\qquad &\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)\\ &\equiv \sup_{I\times J\subset\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)^q\,d\omega(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t)\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}},\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)$ is the 'tail' defined in (1.3) above. When (3.2) holds, we write $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)=\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ and $\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)=\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$, and in the one weight case $v=w$ we simply write $A_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w)$ and $\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w)$.

Lemma 3. *For $1<p,q<\infty$ and $0<\alpha\le m$, $0<\beta\le n$, we have*

$$(3.6)\qquad \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)\le \mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega).$$

Proof. To see this, we begin by noting that for any rectangle $I\times J$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}|x-u| \le \left(|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}+|x-c_I|\right)\left(|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}+|u-c_I|\right) \text{ and } |J|^{\frac{1}{n}}|y-t|\le\left(|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}+|y-c_J|\right)\left(|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}+|t-c_J|\right),\\ &\text{i.e. } |x-u| \le |I|^{\frac{1}{m}}\left(1+\frac{|x-c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)\left(1+\frac{|u-c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right) \text{ and } |y-t|\le |J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\left(1+\frac{|y-c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)\left(1+\frac{|t-c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}&|x-u|^{\alpha-m}\ |y-t|^{\beta-n}\\ \ge\ &|I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}\left(1+\frac{|x-c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{\alpha-m}\left(1+\frac{|u-c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{\alpha-m}\ |J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(1+\frac{|y-c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\beta-n}\left(1+\frac{|t-c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\beta-n}\\ =\ &|I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)\,\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)\ .\end{aligned}$$

Thus for $R>0$ and $f_R(u,t)\equiv \mathbf{1}_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}(u,t)\,\widehat{s}_Q(u,t)^{p'-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(f_R\sigma)(x,y) &= \iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)} |x-u|^{\alpha-n}|y-t|^{\beta-n}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'-1}\,d\sigma(u,t)\\ &\ge \iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)\,\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)\,\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'-1}\,d\sigma(u,t)\\ &= |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)\iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t).\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into the norm inequality (3.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(\iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t)\right)\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)^{q}\,d\omega(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\leq \left\{\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta}(f_R)\,\sigma(x,y)^{q}\,d\omega(x,y)\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\leq \mathbb{N}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)\left\{\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} f_R(u,t)^{p}\,d\sigma(u,t)\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&= \mathbb{N}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)\left(\iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},
\end{aligned}$$

and upon dividing through by $\left(\iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(\iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t)\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)^{q}\,d\omega(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\qquad\leq \mathbb{N}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega), \qquad \text{for all } R>0 \text{ and all rectangles } I\times J.
\end{aligned}$$

Now take the supremum over all $R>0$ and all rectangles $I\times J$ to get (3.6). □

Remark 1. *We have the 'duality' identities* $\mathbb{N}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)=\mathbb{N}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{q',p'}(\omega,\sigma)$ *and* $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)=\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{q',p'}(\omega,\sigma)$.

Remark 2. *Since* $\widehat{s}_{I\times J}\approx 1$ *on* $I\times J$, *we have the inquality* $\mathbb{A}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)\lesssim\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{q',p'}(\omega,\sigma)$. *In particular, we see that in the case*

$$\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}>\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n},$$

say $\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}-\frac{\alpha}{m}=\varepsilon>0$, *we have* $\frac{\alpha}{m}-1=-\varepsilon-\frac{1}{p'}-\frac{1}{q}$, *and so*

$$|I\times J|^{-\varepsilon}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J}d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J}d\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\leq\mathbb{A}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)\lesssim\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega),$$

for all rectangles $I\times J$. *Thus the finiteness of* $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)$ *implies that the measures* σ *and* ω *are carried by* disjoint *sets. We shall not have much more to say regarding this case.*

4. Statements of problems and theorems, and simple proofs

In the 1-parameter setting with **one** weight and **balanced** indices, the characteristic $A_{p,q}(w)$ arose in connection with the operator norm $N_{p,q}(w)$, while in the 1-parameter setting with **two** weights and **general** indices, the two-tailed two weight characteristic $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{\alpha,m}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)$ arose in connection with the operator norm $\mathbb{N}^{\alpha,m}_{p,q}(\sigma,\omega)$.

Thus the 2-parameter questions we investigate in this paper are these.

(1) Is the finiteness of the one weight characteristic $A_{p,q}(w)$ in (4.3) below sufficient for the one weight norm inequality (3.1) with $w=v$ when the indices are balanced, $\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}=\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n}$, and if so what is the dependence of the operator norm $N_{p,q}(w)$ on the characteristic $A_{p,q}(w)$?

(2) Under what conditions on the indices $p, q, \alpha, \beta, m, n$ is the finiteness of the two-tailed characteristic $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ sufficient to control the operator norm $\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ in the norm inequality (3.3)?
(3) If the operator norm $\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ fails to be controlled by the characteristic $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$, what additional side conditions on the weights σ,ω are needed for finiteness of the two-tailed characteristic $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ to imply the norm inequality (3.3)?
(4) If the operator norm $\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ fails to be controlled by the characteristic $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$, is it controlled by the corresponding testing or $T1$ conditions?α, m

4.1. **A one weight theorem.** The special 'one weight' case of (3.1), namely when $v = w$, is equivalent to finiteness of the product characteristic, and we can calculate the optimal power of the characteristic.

Theorem 5. *Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$, and suppose $1 < p, q < \infty$. Let $w(x,y)$ be a nonnegative weight on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the norm inequality*

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f(x,y)^q \; w(x,y)^q \; dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}(w)\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,y)^p \; w(x,y)^p \; dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{4.1}$$

holds for all $f \geq 0$ if and only if *both*

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}, \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$A_{p,q}(w) \equiv \sup_{I\subset\mathbb{R}^m,\ J\subset\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{|I|\,|J|}\int\int_{I\times J} w(x,y)^q \; dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|I|\,|J|}\int\int_{I\times J} w(x,y)^{-p'} \; dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} < \infty, \tag{4.3}$$

if and only if *both (4.2) and*

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n}\left\{\sup_{I\subset\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w^y(x)^q \; dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I w^y(x)^{-p'} \; dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\} &\leq A_{p,q}(w), \\ \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m}\left\{\sup_{J\subset\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{|J|}\int_J w_x(y)^q \; dy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|J|}\int_J w_x(y)^{-p'} \; dy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\} &\leq A_{p,q}(w).\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover

$$N_{p,q}(w) \lesssim A_{p,q}(w)^{2+2\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q},\frac{q}{p'}\right\}}, \tag{4.5}$$

and the exponent $2 + 2\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q}, \frac{q}{p'}\right\}$ is best possible.

There is a substitute for the case $\alpha = \beta = 0$ due to R. Fefferman [Fef, see page 82], namely that the strong maximal function

$$\mathcal{M}f(x,y) \equiv \sup_{I,J}\frac{1}{|I|\,|J|}\int_I\int_J |f(x,y)|\,dxdy, \tag{4.6}$$

is bounded on the weighted space $L^p(w^p)$ if and only if $A_p(w) = A_{p,p}(w)$ is finite. This is proved in [Fef, see page 82] as an application of a rectangle covering lemma, but can also be obtained using iteration, specifically from Theorem 11 below as $\mathcal{M}$ is dominated by the iterated operators in (5.1). Another substitute for the case $\alpha = \beta = 0$ is the boundedness of the double Hilbert transform

$$\mathcal{H}f(x,y) \equiv \int_I\int_J \frac{1}{x-u}\frac{1}{y-t} f(u,t)\,dudt,$$

on $L^p(w^p)$ if and only if $A_p(w)$ is finite. This result, along with corresponding results for more general product Calderón-Zygmund operators, can be easily proved using Theorem 11 below, and are left for the reader.

Before proceeding to state our main two weight theorems, we point out that, without any side conditions at all on the weights, the two-tailed product characteristic $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ *never* controls the operator norm

$\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ for the product fractional integral, and not even for the much smaller product dyadic fractional maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}$ defined on a signed measure μ by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}\mu(x,y) \equiv \sup_{\substack{R=I\times J \text{ dyadic}\\ (x,y)\in R}} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\iint_{I\times J} d|\mu|.$$

(note that $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}\mu \le I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}\mu$ when μ is positive). This failure of $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}$ to control $\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}$ in general is proved by a family of counterexamples in the Appendix below, but we content ourselves here by presenting a simple precursor of this family to show that the smaller product characteristic $\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,m),(\beta,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ doesn't control the weak type operator norm of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}$ (c.f. Lemma 2 in the 1-parameter setting).

Example 1. *Let $0<\alpha,\beta<1$ and $1<p,q<\infty$. Given $0<\rho<\infty$, define a weight pair (σ,ω_ρ) in the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ by*

$$\sigma \equiv \delta_{(0,0)} \text{ and } \omega_\rho \equiv \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \delta_P \text{ where } \mathcal{P} = \left\{\left(2^k, 2^{-\rho k}\right)\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}. \tag{4.7}$$

If $R=I\times J$ is a rectangle in the plane $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$ with sides parallel to the axes that contains $(0,0)$ and satisfies $R\cap\mathcal{P} = \left\{\left(2^k,2^{-\rho k}\right)\right\}_{k=L+1}^{L+N}$ for some $L\ge 0$ and $N\ge 1$, then it follows that

$$|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\beta-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J} d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\iint_{I\times J} d\omega_\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \left(2^{L+N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{-\rho(L+1)}\right)^{\beta-1} N^{\frac{1}{q}} 1^{\frac{1}{p'}}.$$

This expression is uniformly bounded, and hence $\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(1,1)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right)$ is bounded, provided $\rho\le\frac{1-\alpha}{1-\beta}$. On the other hand, the function $f(x,y)\equiv 1$ satisfies $f\in L^p(\sigma)$, while the strong dyadic fractional maximal function satisfies

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}} f\left(2^N,2^{-\rho N}\right) \ge \left|\left(0,2^N\right)\right|^{\alpha-1}\left|\left(0,2^{-\rho N}\right)\right|^{\beta-1}\iint_{[0,2^N)\times[0,2^{-\rho N})} f d\sigma = 2^{N(\alpha-1-\rho(\beta-1))} \ge 1,$$

for all $N\ge 1$ provided $\rho\ge\frac{1-\alpha}{1-\beta}$. Thus if $\rho=\frac{1-\alpha}{1-\beta}$, the weak type operator norm of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}} f$ is infinite:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}\right\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\omega_\rho)} &= \sup_{\substack{\lambda>0\\ \|f\|_{L^p(\sigma)}=1}} \lambda\left|\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}} f\sigma > \lambda\right\}\right|_{\omega_\rho}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}\left|\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}} f\sigma > \frac{1}{2}\right\}\right|_{\omega_\rho}^{\frac{1}{q}} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{N=1}^{\infty}\left|\left(2^N,2^{-\rho N}\right)\right|_{\omega_\rho}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Remark 3. *It is easy to verify that when $\sigma=\delta_{(0,0)}$, the operator norm $\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right)$ is in fact equivalent to the* two-tailed *characteristic $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right)$ for all measures ω. Indeed, as shown in the Appendix below, $\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right)$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right)$ are each equivalent to*

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|x|^{(\alpha-m)q}|y|^{(\beta-n)q}\ d\omega(x,y)\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

We refine the above example in the Appendix to show that $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}$ doesn't control the strong type operator norm of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}$.

4.2. **Two weight theorems - counterexamples.** Here we state the main two weight theorems in this paper, beginning however with an elementary consequence of the one weight result above. For this we use this easy lemma.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that $1<p,q<\infty$ and $0<\alpha<1$ satisfy the balanced and diagonal condition*

$$\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}.$$

(1) *Let v, w be positive weights on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $A_{p,q}(v,w) < \infty$. Then*

$$\left\| \frac{w}{v} \right\|_{L^\infty} \equiv \operatorname{ess} \sup_{(x,y)\in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w(x,y)}{v(x,y)} \leq A_{p,q}(v,w).$$

(2) *Let u be a positive weight on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$A_{p,q}(u) \leq \min\left\{ \|u^q\|_{A_1\times A_1}, \left\| u^{-p'} \right\|_{A_1\times A_1} \right\}.$$

Theorem 6. *Suppose that $1 < p, q < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ satisfy the balanced and diagonal condition*

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}. \tag{4.8}$$

(1) *Suppose that $\left\|\frac{w}{v}\right\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$, and that for some $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, the log convex weight $u_\theta \equiv w^{1-\theta} v^\theta$ satisfies $A_{p,q}(u_\theta) < \infty$. Then the two weight norm inequality (3.1) holds, and moreover*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta} f(x,y)^q \ w(x,y)^q \ dxdy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \ C_{p,q} \left\| \frac{w}{v} \right\|_{L^\infty} A_{p,q}(u_\theta) \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,y)^p \ v(x,y)^p \ dxdy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

(2) *Suppose that $\left\|\frac{w}{v}\right\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$ and $w^q \in A_1 \times A_1$ (respectively $v^{-p'} \in A_1 \times A_1$). Then the case[2] $\theta = 0$ (respectively 1) of (4.9) holds with $\|w^q\|_{A_1\times A_1}$ in place of $A_{p,q}(u_0)$ (respectively $\left\|v^{-p'}\right\|_{A_1\times A_1}$ in place of $A_{p,q}(u_1)$).*

This theorem shows in particular that the (smaller) characteristic $A_{p,q}(v,w)$ controls the two weight norm inequality (3.1) under any of the side conditions (**i**) $A_{p,q}(u_\theta) < \infty$ for some $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, (**ii**) $w^q \in A_1 \times A_1$ or (**iii**) $v^{-p'} \in A_1 \times A_1$. In the case $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}$, the above theorem fails, and *even* under the additional assumptions that *both* σ and ω are absolutely continuous and satisfy the product $A_1 \times A_1$ condition, and that the *two-tailed* characteristic $\widehat{A}_{p,q}(v,w)$ is finite. Recall that the strong maximal function $\mathcal{M}f$ of f is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}f(x,y) \equiv \sup_{I\times J:\ (x,y)\in I\times J} \frac{1}{|I\times J|} \iint_{I\times J} |f| \ ,$$

and that a nonnegative weight $u(x,y)$ satisfies the product $A_1 \times A_1$ condition provided there is a finite constant $C = \|u\|_{A_1\times A_1}$ such that the strong maximal function $\mathcal{M}u$ of u is pointwise dominated by Cu, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M}u(x,y) \leq Cu(x,y).$$

We state and prove the following negative result only for $m = n = 1$, leaving the extension to higher dimensions for the reader. Given $0 < \gamma < 1$ define the (product) weight

$$s^\gamma(x,y) \equiv \mathcal{M}\sigma(x,y)^{1-\gamma} = |x|^{\gamma-1} |y|^{\gamma-1}, \tag{4.10}$$

and the (nonproduct) weight

$$w^\gamma(x,y) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^\infty \left[\mathcal{M}\delta_{(2^k,2^{-k})}\right]^{1-\gamma} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \left|x - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1}. \tag{4.11}$$

Note that both $s^\gamma(x,y)$ and $w^\gamma(x,y)$ satisfy the product $A_1 \times A_1$ condition by Proposition 2 of Coifman-Rochberg [CoRo], and have reverse product doubling exponent γ - a weight u has reverse product doubling exponent $\varepsilon > 0$ if

$$|sI \times tJ|_u \leq Cs^{\varepsilon m} t^{\varepsilon n} |I\times J|_u$$

for all rectangles $I \times J \subset \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $0 < s, t < 1$.

[2]There is an analogue for $0 < \theta < 1$, but the formulation seems awkward, and so leave this for the interested reader.

Theorem 7. *Suppose that* $1 < p, q < \infty$ *and* $0 < \alpha < 1$ *satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \alpha.$$

There exists $1 - \alpha < \gamma < 1$ *such that if* s^γ *and* w^γ *are as in (4.10) and (4.11) above, then we have:*

(1) *the weights* s^γ *and* w^γ *each satisfy the product* A_1 *condition and have reverse product doubling exponent* γ.

(2) *the weight pair* (s^γ, w^γ) *satisfies the fractional Muckenhoupt condition*

$$\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\alpha),(1,1)}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma) < \infty,$$

and even the larger two-tailed version

$$\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\alpha),(1,1)}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma) < \infty.$$

(3) *the operator norm* $\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\alpha),(1,1)}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma)$ *is infinite, and even the strong dyadic fractional maximal operator* $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}$ *fails to be weak type* (p, q) *with respect to the weight pair* (s^γ, w^γ).

4.3. **Two weight theorems - power weights.** We will see below that in the special case that *both* weights are *product* weights, i.e. $w(x, y) = w_1(x) w_2(y)$ and $v(x, y) = v_1(x) v_2(y)$, then the one parameter theory carries over fairly easily to the multiparameter setting. Despite the highly negative nature of the previous theorem for product $A_1 \times A_1$ weights, the 1958 result of Stein and Weiss on power weights *does* carry over to the multiparameter setting using the sandwiching technique of Lemma 1 - where here the power weights are *not* product power weights (the theory for product power weights reduces trivially to that of the 1-parameter setting).

At this point it is instructive to observe that the kernel of the 1-parameter fractional integral $I_{\alpha+\beta}^{m+n}$ is trivially dominated by the kernel of the 2-parameter fractional integral $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$, and hence the corresponding 1-parameter conditions in Theorem 3 are necessary for boundedness of $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$ - namely $p \leq q$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \alpha + \beta < m + n \text{ and } \gamma q < m + n \text{ and } \delta p' < m + n, \\ \gamma + \delta \geq 0, \\ \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha + \beta - (\gamma + \delta)}{m + n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the displayed conditions are equivalent to finiteness of the 1-parameter Muckenhoupt characteristic $A_{p,q}^{\alpha+\beta,m+n}(v_\delta, w_\gamma)$. On the other hand, if we make the much stronger assumption that the sectional Muckenhoupt characteristics $A_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(v_\delta(\cdot, y), w_\gamma(\cdot, y))$ and $A_{p,q}^{\beta,n}(v_\delta(x, \cdot), w_\gamma(x, \cdot))$ are *uniformly bounded* for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ respectively, then a standard iteration (see Theorem 11 below) yields the boundedness of $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$. In fact, the boundedness of $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$ is intermediate between these two extremes, and is given by finiteness of the rectangle Muckenhoupt characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta, w_\gamma)$.

In preparation for using the sandwiching technique to prove Theorem 9 below, we first characterize the indices for which the Muckenhoupt characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta, w_\gamma)$ is finite. For any real number t let $t_+ \equiv \max\{t, 0\}$ and $t_- \equiv \max\{-t, 0\}$ be the positive and negative parts of t. Note that $t = t_+ - t_-$.

Notation 1. *For the statement and proof of the next theorem, we will use the notation* $0_+ \leq A$ *to mean the inequality* $0 < A$.

Theorem 8. *Suppose that*

$$1 < p, q < \infty \text{ and } -\infty < \alpha, \beta < \infty,$$

and $w_\gamma(x, y) = |(x, y)|^{-\gamma}$ *and* $v_\delta(x, y) = |(x, y)|^{\delta}$ *for* $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ *with* $-\infty < \gamma, \delta < \infty$. *Let*

$$\Gamma \equiv \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q'} - \frac{1}{p'},$$

and set

$$\begin{aligned} \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m) &\equiv \left(\gamma - \frac{m}{q}\right)_+ + \left(\delta - \frac{m}{p'}\right)_+, \\ \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n) &\equiv \left(\gamma - \frac{n}{q}\right)_+ + \left(\delta - \frac{n}{p'}\right)_+. \end{aligned}$$

Then the Muckenhoupt characteristic is finite, i.e.

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(v_\delta, w_\gamma\right) < \infty,$$

if and only if *the power weights w_γ^q and $v_\delta^{-p'}$ are locally integrable,*

$$\gamma q < m+n \text{ and } \delta p' < m+n, \tag{4.12}$$

and the following power weight equality and constraint inequalities for α and β hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= \frac{\alpha+\beta-\gamma-\delta}{m+n}, \\ \Gamma + \frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n)}{m} &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} - \frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m)}{m}, \\ \Gamma + \frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m)}{n} &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} - \frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n)}{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Here now is our extension of the classical Stein-Weiss theorem to the product setting.

Theorem 9. *Let $w_\gamma(x,y) = |(x,y)|^{-\gamma} = \left(|x|^2+|y|^2\right)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}$ and $v_\delta(x,y) = |(x,y)|^{\delta} = \left(|x|^2+|y|^2\right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}$ be a pair of nonnegative power weights on $\mathbb{R}^{m+n} = \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $-\infty < \gamma, \delta < \infty$. Let $1 < p, q < \infty$ and $-\infty < \alpha, \beta < \infty$. Then the two weight norm inequality (3.1) holds, i.e.*

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f(x,y)^q \ |(x,y)|^{-\gamma q} \ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(v_\delta, w_\gamma\right)\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,y)^p \ |(x,y)|^{\delta p} \ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{4.14}$$

for all $f \geq 0$ ***if and only if*** *the indices p, q satisfy*

$$p \leq q, \tag{4.15}$$

and the Muckenhoupt characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(v_\delta, w_\gamma\right)$ is finite, i.e.

$$\sup_{I\subset\mathbb{R}^m,\ J\subset\mathbb{R}^n} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(\int\int_{I\times J}|(x,y)|^{-\gamma q}\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int\int_{I\times J}|(u,t)|^{-\delta p'}\ dudt\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} < \infty.$$

4.4. **Two weight theorems - $T1$ or testing conditions.** Our final theorem shows that not even the testing or $T1$ conditions are sufficient in general for the weighted norm inequality in the strictly subbalanced case $\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q} < \alpha$. Recall that a weight u satisfies the product doubling condition if $|2R|_u \leq C|R|_u$ for all rectangles R, and that this condition implies the weaker product reverse doubling condition.

Theorem 10. *Suppose that $1 < p < q < \infty$ and $0 < \frac{\alpha}{m}, \frac{\beta}{n} < 1$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q} < \min\left\{\frac{\alpha}{m}, \frac{\beta}{n}\right\},$$

and suppose that the locally finite positive Borel measures σ and ω satisfy the product doubling condition and have product reverse doubling exponent $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon')$ that satisfies

$$1-\frac{\alpha}{m} < \varepsilon < \frac{1-\frac{\alpha}{m}}{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}} \text{ and } 1-\frac{\beta}{n} < \varepsilon' < \frac{1-\frac{\beta}{n}}{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}. \tag{4.16}$$

Then if the two weight characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)$ is finite, the following testing (or $T1$) conditions hold: for all rectangles $R \subset \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}\left(\mathbf{1}_R\sigma\right)(x,y)^q \ d\omega(x,y)\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} &\leq C_{p,q}\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,m),(\beta,n)}(\sigma,\omega)|R|_\sigma^{\frac{1}{p}}, \\ \left\{\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}\left(\mathbf{1}_R\omega\right)(x,y)^{p'} \ d\sigma(x,y)\right\}^{\frac{1}{p'}} &\leq C_{p,q}\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,m),(\beta,n)}(\sigma,\omega)|R|_\omega^{\frac{1}{q'}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Remark 4. *The testing condition in the first line of (4.17) only requires the reverse doubling assumption on σ, while the testing condition in the second line only requires reverse doubling of ω.*

Corollary 1. *Suppose that*

$$0 < \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \alpha.$$

Let the weights s^γ and w_ρ^γ be as defined in (4.10) and (4.11), and suppose that the conclusions of Theorem 7 hold with $1-\alpha < \gamma < \frac{1-\alpha}{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}$. Then the two-tailed characteristic $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma)$ is finite, and the testing conditions (4.17) hold with constant $\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,m),(\beta,n)}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma)$, but the norm inequality (3.3) fails.

Proof. The assumption $1-\alpha < \gamma < \frac{1-\alpha}{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}$ implies (4.16) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon' = \gamma$ and $m = n = 1$, and so both Theorem 7 and Theorem 10 apply. □

This corollary points to the almost complete failure of the familiar 1-parameter two weight theory to extend to the 2-parameter setting. In the 1-parameter two weight setting the norm inequality for $p < q$ is characterized by the two-tailed characteristic and also by the testing conditions. In the 2-parameter setting, both characterizations fail, and even when both weights are assumed to satisfy the product A_1 condition, the strongest of the Muckenhoupt conditions that can be imposed on an individual weight.

The proofs of our positive results in the one weight case involve the standard techniques of iteration, Lebesgue's differentiation theorem and Minkowski's inequality, and the proof of the product version of the Stein-Weiss two power weight extension involves the sandwiching technique as well, while the proofs of the negative results in the two weight case require delicate constructions of counterexamples and a quasiorthogonality argument to derive the testing conditions from the characteristic and reverse doubling assumptions on the weights. We begin with the simpler one weight norm inequality and the special case of the two weight inequality when the weights are product weights. Some of this material generalizes naturally from product fractional integrals to *iterated operators* to which we now turn.

5. Iterated operators

The product fractional integral $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f \equiv \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} * f$, where

$$\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(x,y) = |x|^{\alpha-m} |y|^{\beta-n}, \qquad (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

is an example of an *iterated operator*. In order to precisely define what we mean by an iterated operator, we denote the collection of nonnegative measurable functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n) \equiv \{g : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0,\infty] : g \text{ is Lebesgue measurable}\},$$

and we refer to a mapping $T : \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to itself as an *operator* on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, without any assumption of additional properties. If T_1 is an operator on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m)$, we define its *product extension* to an operator $T_1 \otimes \delta_0$ on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$(T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f(x,y) = T_1 f^y(x), \qquad f \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n),$$

and similarly, if T_2 is an operator on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we define its *product extension* to an operator $\delta_0 \otimes T_2$ on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$(\delta_0 \otimes T_2) f(x,y) = T_2 f_x(y), \qquad f \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Definition 1. *If T_1 is an operator on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and T_2 is an operator on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then the composition operator*

$$T = (\delta_0 \otimes T_2) \circ (T_1 \otimes \delta_0)$$

on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ is called an iterated operator.

To see that $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$ is an iterated operator, define $\Omega_{\alpha}^{m}(x)=|x|^{\alpha-m}$ and $\Omega_{\beta}^{n}(y)=|y|^{\beta-n}$ and set $I_{\gamma}^{k}g=\Omega_{\gamma}^{k}*g$. Then extend the operator I_{α}^{m} from $\mathbb{R}^m$ to the product space $\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n$ by defining

$$\begin{aligned}(I_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0)f(x,y) &= [\Omega_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0]*f(x,y)\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\Omega_{\alpha}^{m}(x-u)\,\delta_0(y-v)\,f(u,v)\,dudv\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\Omega_{\alpha}^{m}(x-u)\,f(u,y)\,du\\ &= I_{\alpha}^{m}f^{y}(x),\end{aligned}$$

where $f^{y}(u)\equiv f(u,y)$, and similarly define

$$\left(\delta_0\otimes I_{\beta}^{n}\right)f(x,y)=I_{\beta}^{n}f_{x}(y),$$

where $f_x(v)\equiv f(x,v)$. Then from $\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(x,y)=\Omega_{\alpha}^{m}(x)\,\Omega_{\beta}^{n}(y)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}f(x,y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(x-u,y-v)\,f(u,v)\,dudv\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Omega_{\beta}^{n}(y-v)\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\Omega_{\alpha}^{m}(x-u)\,f^{v}(u)\,du\right\}dv\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Omega_{\beta}^{n}(y-v)\left\{I_{\alpha}^{m}f^{v}(x)\right\}dv\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Omega_{\beta}^{n}(y-v)\left\{(I_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0)f(x,\nu)\right\}dv\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Omega_{\beta}^{n}(y-v)\left\{[(I_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0)f]_{x}(\nu)\right\}dv\\ &= I_{\beta}^{n}[(I_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0)f]_{x}(y)\\ &= \left(\delta_0\otimes I_{\beta}^{n}\right)\circ(I_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0)f(x,y).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}=\left(\delta_0\otimes I_{\beta}^{n}\right)\circ(I_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0),$$

and similarly we have

$$I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}=(I_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0)\circ\left(\delta_0\otimes I_{\beta}^{n}\right),$$

which expresses $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}$ as an iterated operator, namely the compostion of two commuting operators $I_{\alpha}^{m}\otimes\delta_0$ and $\delta_0\otimes I_{\beta}^{n}$.

More generally, we can consider the operator

$$Tf(x,y)=(K*f)(x,y)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}K(x-u,y-v)\,f(u,v)\,dudv\ ,$$

where K is a *product kernel* on $\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$K(x,y)=K_1(x)\,K_2(y),\qquad (x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n,$$

and obtain the factorizations

$$T=(K_1\otimes\delta_0)\circ(\delta_0\otimes K_2)=(\delta_0\otimes K_2)\circ(K_1\otimes\delta_0)$$

of T into iterated operators where

$$\begin{aligned}(K_1\otimes\delta_0)*g(x,y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}K_1(x-u)\,\delta_0(y-v)\,g(u,v)\,dudv\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}K_1(x-u)\,g(u,y)\,du\\ &= K_1*g^{y}(x),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$(\delta_0\otimes K_2)*h(x,y)=K_2*g_{x}(y).$$

As a final example, let $T_1 = M_{\mathbb{R}^m}$ be the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and let $T_2 = M_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ be the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then the iterated operator

$$T = (\delta_0 \otimes T_2) \circ (T_1 \otimes \delta_0) = (\delta_0 \otimes M_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \circ (M_{\mathbb{R}^m} \otimes \delta_0) \tag{5.1}$$

is usually denoted $M_{\mathbb{R}^n}(M_{\mathbb{R}^m})$, and the other iterated operator by $M_{\mathbb{R}^m}(M_{\mathbb{R}^n})$. They both dominate the strong maximal operator $\mathcal{M}$ given in (4.6).

5.1. **One weight inequalities for iterated operators.** Define the iterated Lebesgue spaces $L^{p,q}_{m,n}$ on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\|F\|_{L^{p,q}_{m,n}} \equiv \left\| \|F\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^m)} \right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} F(x,y)^p \, dx \right\}^{\frac{q}{p}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

In the proof of the next theorem we will use Minkowski's inequality for nonnegative functions,

$$\|F\|_{L^{p,q}_{m,n}} \leq \|F\|_{L^{q,p}_{n,m}}, \qquad \text{for all } F \geq 0 \text{ and } 1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty,$$

which written out in full is

$$\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,y)^p \, dy \right\}^{\frac{q}{p}} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} F(x,y)^q \, dx \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Theorem 11. *Let $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ and $T_1 : \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m) \to \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and $T_2 : \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Suppose that $w(x,y) \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies*

$$\|T_1 g\|_{L^q((w^y)^q)} \leq C_1 \|g\|_{L^p((w^y)^p)}, \qquad \text{for all } g \geq 0, \tag{5.2}$$

uniformly for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and

$$\|T_2 h\|_{L^q((w_x)^q)} \leq C_2 \|h\|_{L^p((w_x)^p)}, \qquad \text{for all } h \geq 0, \tag{5.3}$$

uniformly for $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then the iterated operator $T = (\delta_0 \otimes T_2) \circ (T_1 \otimes \delta_0)$ satisfies

$$\|Tf\|_{L^q(w^q)} \leq C_1 C_2 \|f\|_{L^p(w^p)}, \qquad \text{for all } f \geq 0.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Tf\|_{L^q(w^q)} &= \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\delta_0 \otimes T_2) \circ (T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f(x,y)^q \, w(x,y)^q \, dydx \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&= \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |T_2 [(T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f]_x (y)|^q \, w_x(y)^q \, dy \right] dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&= \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \|T_2 [(T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f]_x\|^q_{L^q((w_x)^q)} \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&\leq C_2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \|[(T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f]_x\|^q_{L^p((w_x)^p)} \, dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&= C_2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f(x,y)^p \, w(x,y)^p \, dy \right\}^{\frac{q}{p}} dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $h = [(T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f]_x \geq 0$ in (5.3). Then by Minkowski's inequality applied to the nonnegative function $F = (T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f(x,y)\ w(x,y)$, this is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} (T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f(x,y)^q w(x,y)^q \, dx \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
= \ & C_2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} T_1 f^y(x)^q w^y(x)^q \, dx \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
= \ & C_2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|T_1 f^y\|^p_{L^q((w^y)^q)} \, dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
\leq \ & C_2 C_1 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|f^y\|^p_{L^p((w^y)^p)} \, dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} = C_2 C_1 \|f\|_{L^p(w^p)} \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $g = f^y \geq 0$ in (5.2). □

In the special case that

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}, \tag{5.4}$$

we can exploit the equivalence of the product $A_{p,q}$ condition (4.3) with the iterated $A_{p,q}$ condition (4.3) to obtain a characterization of the one weight $L^p \to L^q$ inequality for $I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta}$. In fact, condition (5.4) is actually necessary for the product $A_{p,q}$ condition (4.3) to be finite.

Definition 2. *We set*

$$A^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(w) \equiv \sup_{I \subset \mathbb{R}^m,\ J \subset \mathbb{R}^n} |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}} |J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{|I \times J|_{w^q}}{|I \times J|} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{|I \times J|_{w^{p'}}}{|I \times J|} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}.$$

Claim 1. *If $N^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n),}_{p,q}(w) < \infty$ for some weight w, then (5.4) holds.*

Proof. Following the proof of Theorem 13 in the Appendix, we apply Hölder's inequality with dual exponents $\frac{p'+1}{p'}$ and $p'+1$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
1 \ &= \ \left\{ \frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w^{\frac{p'}{p'+1}} w^{-\frac{p'}{p'+1}} \right\}^{\frac{p'+1}{p'}} \\
&\leq \ \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w \right)^{\frac{p'}{p'+1}} \left(\frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'+1}} \right\}^{\frac{p'+1}{p'}} \\
&= \ \left(\frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w \right) \left(\frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
&\leq \ \left(\frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}} |J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}} \\
\leq \ & |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}} |J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|I \times J|} \int \int_{I \times J} w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
= \ & |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1} |J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} \left(\int \int_{I \times J} w^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\int \int_{I \times J} w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \leq N^{\alpha,m}_{p,q}(w)
\end{aligned}$$

for all rectangles $I \times J$, which implies $\frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\beta}{n}$ as required. □

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 5.** Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 5.

Proof of Theorem 5. By Claim 1 the balanced and diagonal condition (5.4) holds. Thus we have the necessity of (4.3) follows from Lemma 3 above:

$$\left(\frac{1}{|I|\,|J|}\int\int_{I\times J} w\left(u,v\right)^{-p'}\,dudv\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\frac{1}{|I|\,|J|}\int\int_{I\times J} w\left(x,y\right)^{q}\,\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\leq N_{p,q}\left(w\right).$$

By letting the cubes J and I shrink separately to points $y\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^m$, we obtain (4.4). Then from the one weight theorem of Muckenhoupt and Wheeden above, Theorem 1, we conclude that both (5.2) and (5.3) hold with $T_1 g=\Omega_\alpha^m * g$ and $T_2 h=\Omega_\beta^n * h$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 11 proves the norm inequality (4.1).

Finally, the estimate (4.5) follows upon using the estimate of Lacey, Moen, Pérez and Torres [LaMoPeTo, LaMoPeTo], which gives

$$C_1\lesssim A_{p,q}\left(w^y\right)^{q\max\left\{1,\frac{p'}{q}\right\}\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{m}\right)}\text{ and }C_2\lesssim A_{p,q}\left(w_x\right)^{q\max\left\{1,\frac{p'}{q}\right\}\left(1-\frac{\beta}{n}\right)},$$

uniformly in x and y, upon noting that the characteristic $A_{p,q}$ used in [LaMoPeTo, LaMoPeTo] is the q^{th} power of that defined here. Then using that

$$q\max\left\{1,\frac{p'}{q}\right\}\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{m}\right)=\max\left\{q,p'\right\}\left(\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}\right)=1+\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q},\frac{q}{p'}\right\},$$

we obtain (4.5). Sharpness of the exponent follows upon taking product power weights and product power functions and then arguing as in the previous work of Buckley [**?**, Buc] and Lacey, Moen, Pérez and Torres [LaMoPeTo]. □

5.3. **Two weight inequalities for product weights.** If in addition we consider *product* weights, then we can prove *two weight* versions of the theorem and corollary above using essentially the same proof strategy, namely iteration of one parameter operators.

Theorem 12. *Let $1\leq p\leq q\leq\infty$ and $T_1:\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbb{R}^m\right)\to\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbb{R}^m\right)$ and $T_2:\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)\to\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)$. Suppose that $w\left(x,y\right)=w_1\left(x\right)w_2\left(y\right)$ and $v\left(x,y\right)=v_1\left(x\right)v_2\left(y\right)$ are both product weights, and that the weight pairs (w_1,v_1) and (w_2,v_2) on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$ respectively satisfy*

$$\left\|T_1 g\right\|_{L^q\left(w_1^q\right)}\leq C_1\left\|g\right\|_{L^p\left(v_1^p\right)}\ ,\qquad\text{for all }g\geq 0, \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\left\|T_2 h\right\|_{L^q\left(w_2^q\right)}\leq C_2\left\|h\right\|_{L^p\left(v_2^p\right)}\ ,\qquad\text{for all }h\geq 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Then the iterated operator $T=\left(\delta_0\otimes T_2\right)\circ\left(T_1\otimes\delta_0\right)$ satisfies

$$\left\|Tf\right\|_{L^q\left(w^q\right)}\leq C_1C_2\left\|f\right\|_{L^p\left(v^p\right)}\ ,\qquad\text{for all }f\geq 0.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|Tf\right\|_{L^q\left(w^q\right)} &= \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\delta_0\otimes T_2\right)\circ\left(T_1\otimes\delta_0\right)f\left(x,y\right)^q w\left(x,y\right)^q\,dydx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&= \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left|T_2\left[\left(T_1\otimes\delta_0\right)f\right]_x\left(y\right)\right|^q w_1\left(x\right)^q w_2\left(y\right)^q\,dy\right]dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&= \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left\|T_2\left[\left(T_1\otimes\delta_0\right)f\right]_x\right\|_{L^q\left(\left(w_2\right)^q\right)}^q w_1\left(x\right)^q\,dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\leq C_2\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left\|\left[\left(T_1\otimes\delta_0\right)f\right]_x\right\|_{L^p\left(\left(v_2\right)^p\right)}^q w_1\left(x\right)^q\,dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&= C_2\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(T_1\otimes\delta_0\right)f\left(x,y\right)^p v_2\left(y\right)^p w_1\left(x\right)^p\,dy\right\}^{\frac{q}{p}}dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $h = [(T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f]_x \geq 0$ in (5.6). Then by Minkowski's inequality applied to the nonnegative function $F = (T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f(x,y)\ v_2(y) w_1(x)$, this is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned} & C_2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} (T_1 \otimes \delta_0) f(x,y)^q v_2(y)^q w_1(x)^q dx \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ = & C_2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} T_1 f^y(x)^q w_1(x)^q dx \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} v_2(y)^p dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ = & C_2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|T_1 f^y\|^p_{L^q((w_1)^q)} v_2(y)^p dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ \leq & C_2 C_1 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|f^y\|^p_{L^p((v_1)^p)} v_2(y)^p dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} = C_2 C_1 \|f\|_{L^p(v^p)}\ , \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $g = f^y \geq 0$ in (5.5). □

Corollary 2. *Suppose* $1 < p < q < \infty$ *and* $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}$. *Let* $w(x,y) = w_1(x) w_2(y)$ *and* $v(x,y) = v_1(x) v_2(y)$ *be a pair of nonnegative* product *weights on* $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$. *Then*

$$\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta} f(x,y)^q\ w(x,y)^q\ dxdy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C_{p,q}(w,v) \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,y)^p\ v(x,y)^p\ dxdy \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{5.7}$$

for all $f \geq 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{I \subset \mathbb{R}^m,\ J \subset \mathbb{R}^n} & \left(\frac{1}{|I|\,|J|} \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} (\widehat{s}_{I,J} w)(x,y)^q\ dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \times \left(\frac{1}{|I|\,|J|} \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\widehat{s}_{I,J} v^{-1}\right)(x,y)^{p'}\ dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \equiv \widetilde{A}_{p,q}(w,v) < \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where $\widehat{s}_{I,J}(x,y) = \widehat{s}_I(x)\,\widehat{s}_J(y) = \left(1 + \frac{|x - c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{\alpha - m} \left(1 + \frac{|y - c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{\beta - n}$. *Moreover,*

$$C_{p,q}(w,v) \approx \widetilde{A}_{p,q}(w,v)\,. \tag{5.9}$$

Proof. The necessity of (5.8) is again a standard exercise in adapting the one parameter argument in Sawyer and Wheeden to the setting of product weights.

Now we turn to the sufficiency of (5.8). Since our weights w and v are product weights, the double integrals on the left hand side of (5.8) each factor as a product of integrals over $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$ separately, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{|I|\,|J|} \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} (\widehat{s}_{I,J} w)(x,y)^q\ dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ = & \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} (\widehat{s}_I w_1)(x)^q\ dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|J|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\widehat{s}_J w_2)(y)^q\ dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, the characteristic $\widehat{A}_{p,q}(w,v)$ defined in (5.8) can be rewritten as

$$\widetilde{A}_{p,q}(w,v) = \widehat{A}_{p,q}(w_1,v_1)\,\widehat{A}_{p,q}(w_2,v_2)\,. \tag{5.10}$$

From the two weight theorem of Sawyer and Wheeden above, Theorem 2, we conclude that (5.5) holds with $T_1 g = \Omega^m_\alpha * g$ and constant $C_1 = C\widehat{A}_{p,q}(w_1,v_1)$, and that (5.6) holds with $T_2 h = \Omega^n_\beta * h$ and constant $C_2 = C\widehat{A}_{p,q}(w_2,v_2)$. This precise dependence on $\widehat{A}_{p,q}(w_2,v_2)$ is not explicitly stated in 2, but it is easily checked by tracking the constants in the proof given there. See also the detailed proof in the appendix below. Then the conclusion of the theorem proves the norm inequality (5.7), and also the equivalence (5.9), in view of (5.10). □

Remark 5. *If we restrict the function f in the norm inequality in the corollary above to be a product function $f(x,y)=f_1(x)\,f_2(y)$, then $\left(\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}*f\right)(x,y)$ is the product function $\Omega_\alpha^m*f_1(x)\ \Omega_\beta^n*f_2(y)$, and there is a particularly trivial proof of the norm bound for such f:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}*f\right)(x,y)^q\ w(x,y)^q\ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&= \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\Omega_\alpha^m*f_1(x)^q\ w_1(x)^q\ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Omega_\beta^n*f_2(y)^q\ w_2(y)^q\ dy\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\leq C_1\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}f_1(x)^p\ w_1(x)^p\ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}C_2\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}f_2(y)^p\ w_2(y)^p\ dy\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&= C_1C_2\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}f(x,y)^p\ w(x,y)^p\ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 6. *We have the following poinwise limit for w_1 above:*

$$\lim_{I\to x_0}\left(\frac{1}{|I|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\widehat{s}_I w_1\right)(x)^q\ dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}=Cw_1(x_0),\qquad \text{for a.e. } x_0\in\mathbb{R}^m. \tag{5.11}$$

Indeed, with $I_0\equiv\left[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right]$, the function

$$\widehat{s}_{I_0}(x)^q=(1+|x|)^{-(m-\alpha)q}=(1+|x|)^{-m-m\frac{q}{p'}},\qquad x\in\mathbb{R}^m,$$

is such that the family $\left\{\frac{1}{r^m}\widehat{s}_{I_0}^q\left(\frac{\cdot}{r}\right)\right\}_{r>0}$ is an approximate identity on $\mathbb{R}^m$, and thus (5.11) holds at every Lebesgue point of w_1^q, since w_1^q obviously satisfies the growth condition,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}(1+|x|)^{-m\left(1+\frac{q}{p'}\right)}w_1(x)^q\,dx=\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}(1+|x|)^{-q(m-\alpha)}w_1(x)^q\,dx\leq C<\infty, \tag{5.12}$$

when v_1 is not the trivial weight identically infinity. Similar pointwise limits hold for the remaining three functions w_2, v_1 and v_2.

6. Proof of Theorem 6

We begin with the proof of Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 4. Recall that the indices are balanced, i.e. $\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}=\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n}$, so that $|I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}=\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}$. Now let $I\times J$ shrink to a point $(X,Y)\in\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n$ in the expression (1.1) for the $A_{p,q}(v,w)$ characteristic, and apply Lebesgue's differentiation theorem to obtain

$$A_{p,q}(v,w)\geq\lim_{I\times J\searrow(X,Y)}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J}w(x,y)^q\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J}v(x,y)^{-p'}\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}=\frac{w(X,Y)}{v(X,Y)},$$

for almost every (X,Y). This proves the first assertion.

Now suppose that $v^{-p'}\in A_1\times A_1$. Then

$$\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J}v^{-p'}\leq\left\|v^{-p'}\right\|_{A_1\times A_1}\left(\inf_{I\times J}v^{-p'}\right)$$

for all rectangles $I \times J$, and so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J} v(x,y)^q\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J} v(x,y)^{-p'}\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J} v(x,y)^q\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left\|v^{-p'}\right\|_{A_1\times A_1}^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\inf_{I\times J} v^{-1}\right)\\
&= \left\|v^{-p'}\right\|_{A_1\times A_1}^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J}\left(\frac{v(x,y)}{\sup_{I\times J} v}\right)^q\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \left\|v^{-p'}\right\|_{A_1\times A_1}^{\frac{1}{p'}},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the second assertion for $v^{-p'}$. Similarly, if $w^q \in A_1 \times A_1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J} w(x,y)^q\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J} w(x,y)^{-p'}\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&\leq \|w^q\|_{A_1\times A_1}^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\inf_{I\times J} w\right)\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J} w(x,y)^{-p'}\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= \|w^q\|_{A_1\times A_1}^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|I\times J|}\iint_{I\times J}\left(\frac{\inf_{I\times J} w}{w(x,y)}\right)^{p'}\ dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \leq \|w^q\|_{A_1\times A_1}^{\frac{1}{q}},
\end{aligned}$$

and this completes the proof of Lemma 4. □

Now we can complete the proof of Theorem 6 in a matter of lines. With $u_\theta \equiv w^{1-\theta}v^\theta$ we have from Lemma 4 the pointwise inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
w &\leq A_{p,q}(v,w)\ v \quad a.e.\\
w &\leq A_{p,q}(v,w)^\theta\ u_\theta \quad a.e.\\
u_\theta &\leq A_{p,q}(v,w)^{1-\theta}\ v \quad a.e.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Thus from (6.1) and Theorem 5 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f(x,y)^q\ w(x,y)^q\ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\leq A_{p,q}(v,w)^\theta\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n} f(x,y)^q\ u_\theta(x,y)^q\ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\leq A_{p,q}(v,w)^\theta A_{p,q}(u_\theta)\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,y)^p\ u_\theta(x,y)^p\ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&\leq A_{p,q}(v,w)^\theta A_{p,q}(u_\theta) A_{p,q}(v,w)^{1-\theta}\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,y)^p\ v(x,y)^p\ dxdy\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the first assertion of Theorem 6. The second assertion is an immediate consequence of this together with the second assertion of Lemma 4.

7. Proof of Theorem 7

We begin with the definition of the product $A_1 \times A_1$ condition and the product reverse doubling exponents. In the next subsection we determine conditions on the parameter γ so that the weight pair (s^γ, w^γ) defined by (4.10) and (4.11) has finite product Muckenhoupt characteristic. Then in the final subsection we determine conditions on γ for which the product fractional integral fails to be bounded, and complete the proof of Theorem 7.

7.1. **Product $A_1 \times A_1$ and product reverse doubling exponents.** It is well known that for $0 < \gamma < 1$, the weight $\lambda^\gamma(x) = |x|^{\gamma-1}$ on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the A_1 condition $M\lambda^\gamma(x) \le C_\gamma \lambda^\gamma(x)$, and has reverse doubling exponent γ, i.e.

$$\frac{\int_{tI} \lambda^\gamma(x)\,dx}{\int_I \lambda^\gamma(x)\,dx} \le C_\gamma t^\gamma, \qquad \text{for all intervals } I \text{ and } 0 < t < 1.$$

It then follows immediately that $s^\gamma(x,y) = \lambda^\gamma(x)\lambda^\gamma(y)$ satisfies the rectangle A_1 condition $\mathcal{M}s^\gamma(x,y) \le C_\gamma^2 s^\gamma(x,y)$ with reverse doubling exponent γ. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} M_x w^\gamma(x,y) &= M_x\left(\sum_{k=1}^\infty \lambda^\gamma\left(x-2^k\right)\lambda^\gamma\left(y-2^{-k}\right)\right) \\ &\le \sum_{k=1}^\infty \lambda^\gamma\left(y-2^{-k}\right) M_x\left[\lambda^\gamma\left(x-2^k\right)\right] \\ &\le \sum_{k=1}^\infty \lambda^\gamma\left(y-2^{-k}\right) C_\gamma\left[\lambda^\gamma\left(x-2^k\right)\right] = C_\gamma w^\gamma(x,y), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\mathcal{M}w^\gamma(x,y) \le M_y M_x w^\gamma(x,y) \le C_\gamma M_y w^\gamma(x,y) \le C_\gamma^2 w^\gamma(x,y),$$

which shows that $w^\gamma(x,y)$ also satisfies the product $A_1 \times A_1$ condition. It is an easy exercise to show that the reverse doubling exponent of w^γ is also γ.

7.2. **The Muckenhoupt characteristics.** First we estimate the weight $w^\gamma(x,y)$ for $(x,y) \in [0,\infty)\times\left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]$. Define positive integers $M = M(x)$ and $L = L(y)$ depending on x and y respectively by

$$\left|x-2^M\right| = \inf_{N\ge 1}\left|x-2^N\right| \text{ and } \left|y-2^{-L}\right| = \inf_{N\ge 1}\left|y-2^{-\rho N}\right|.$$

Thus $M(x) \sim \log_2 x$ for $x > 1$ and $L(y) \sim -\log_2 y$ for $0 < y < 1$. We claim that

$$w^\gamma(x,y) \approx \tag{7.1}$$
$$\begin{cases} \left(2^{(1-\rho)\frac{M(x)+L(y)}{2}}\left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}}-1\right|\left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho L(y)}}-1\right|\right)^{\gamma-1} & \text{if } M(x) = L(y) \\ \left(\left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}}-1\right|\right)^{\gamma-1} + |M(x)-L(y)| + \left(\left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho L(y)}}-1\right|\right)^{\gamma-1} & \text{if } M(x) < L(y) \\ 2^{(M(x)-L(y))(\gamma-1)}\left\{\left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1} + |M(x)-L(y)| + \left|\frac{y}{2^{-L(y)}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}\right\} & \text{if } M(x) > L(y) \end{cases},$$

for $(x,y) \in [0,\infty)\times\left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]$.

Define $[b,a]$ to be the interval $[a,b]$ if $a < b$. First we suppose that $M = M(x) = L(y)$, i.e. $xy \approx 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_\rho^\gamma(x,y) &= \sum_{k=1}^\infty \left|x-2^k\right|^{\gamma-1}\left|y-2^{-\rho k}\right|^{\gamma-1} \\ &= \left\{\sum_{k=1}^{M-2} + \sum_{k=M-1}^{M+1} + \sum_{k=M+2}^\infty\right\}\left|x-2^k\right|^{\gamma-1}\left|y-2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} \equiv I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} I &\approx \sum_{k=1}^{M-2}\left|2^M-2^k\right|^{\gamma-1}\left|2^{-\rho M}-2^{-\rho k}\right|^{\gamma-1} \approx 2^{M(\gamma-1)}\sum_{k=1}^{M-2} 2^{-k(\gamma-1)} \\ &\approx 2^{M(\gamma-1)}2^{-M(\gamma-1)} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$II \approx \left|x-2^M\right|^{\gamma-1}\left|y-2^{-M}\right|^{\gamma-1} = \left|\frac{x}{2^M}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}\left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho M}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} III &\approx \sum_{k=M+2}^{\infty} \left|2^M - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|2^{-M} - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} \approx \left(\sum_{k=M+2}^{\infty} 2^{k(\gamma-1)}\right) 2^{-M(\gamma-1)} \\ &\approx 2^{M(\gamma-1)} 2^{-M(\gamma-1)} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

so that we have

$$w^{\gamma}(x,y) \approx \left|x - 2^{M(x)}\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-L(y)}\right|^{\gamma-1}, \qquad \text{if } M = M(x) = L(y).$$

Next we suppose that $M = M(x) < L(y) = L$, i.e. $xy \lesssim 1$, which is the case when the point (x,y) lies essentially *beneath* the unit hyperbola $\mathcal{H}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} w^{\gamma}(x,y) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left|x - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} \\ &\approx \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \left|2^M - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} + \left|x - 2^M\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|2^{-L} - 2^M\right|^{\gamma-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=M+1}^{L-1} \left|x - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} + \left|2^M - 2^L\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-L}\right|^{\gamma-1} + \sum_{k=L+1}^{\infty} \left|x - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which we write as

$$w^{\gamma}(x,y) \approx I + II + III + IV + V.$$

We have

$$I \approx 2^{M(\gamma-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} 2^{-k(\gamma-1)} \approx 2^{M(\gamma-1)} 2^{-M(\gamma-1)} = 1,$$

and

$$II \approx \left|x - 2^M\right|^{\gamma-1} 2^{-M(\gamma-1)} = \left|\frac{x}{2^M} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1},$$

and

$$III \approx \sum_{k=M+1}^{L-1} \left|2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} = \sum_{k=M+1}^{L-1} 1 = L - M,$$

and similarly

$$IV \approx \left|\frac{y}{2^{-L}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1}$$

and

$$V \approx 1.$$

Thus we have

$$w_{\rho}^{\gamma}(x,y) \approx \left|\frac{x}{2^M} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} + |L(y) - M(x)| + \left|\frac{y}{2^{-L}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1}, \qquad xy \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Finally we suppose that $M = M(x) > L(y) = L$, i.e. $xy \gtrsim 1$, which is the case when the point (x,y) lies *above* the unit hyperbola $\mathcal{H}$. Then the analogous calculations again yield

$$\begin{aligned} w^{\gamma}(x,y) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left|x - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} \\ &\approx \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} \left|2^M - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} + \left|2^M - 2^L\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-L}\right|^{\gamma-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=L+1}^{M-1} \left|x - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1} + \left|x - 2^M\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|2^{-L} - 2^{-M}\right|^{\gamma-1} + \sum_{k=M+1}^{\infty} \left|x - 2^k\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|y - 2^{-k}\right|^{\gamma-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which we write as

$$w^{\gamma}(x,y) \approx I + II + III + IV + V.$$

We have

$$I \approx 2^{M(\gamma-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} 2^{-k(\gamma-1)} \approx 2^{M(\gamma-1)} 2^{-L(\gamma-1)} = 2^{(M-L)(\gamma-1)},$$

and

$$II \approx 2^{M(\gamma-1)} \left|y - 2^{-L}\right|^{\gamma-1} = 2^{(M-L)(\gamma-1)} \left|\frac{y}{2^{-L}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1},$$

and

$$III \approx \sum_{k=L+1}^{M-1} \left|2^{M}\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|2^{-L}\right|^{\gamma-1} = 2^{(M-L)(\gamma-1)} (M-L),$$

and similarly

$$IV \approx \left|x - 2^{M}\right|^{\gamma-1} \left|2^{-L}\right|^{\gamma-1} \qquad 2^{(M-L)(\gamma-1)} \left|\frac{x}{2^{M}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1}$$

and

$$V \approx 2^{(M-L)(\gamma-1)}.$$

Thus we have

$$w^{\gamma}(x,y) \approx 2^{(M(x)-L(y))(\gamma-1)} \left\{ \left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} + |M(x) - L(y)| + \left|\frac{y}{2^{-L(y)}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} \right\}, \qquad xy \geq 2.$$

This completes the proof of (7.1).

7.2.1. *Finiteness of* $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{\alpha,\alpha}(s^{\gamma}, w^{\gamma})$. Here we define a range for the index $0 < \gamma < 1$ so that the weight pair (s^{γ}, w^{γ}) satisfies the $\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,\alpha}$ condition:

$$\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,\alpha}(s^{\gamma}, w^{\gamma}) = \sup_{I \times J} |I|^{\alpha-1} |J|^{\alpha-1} \left(\iint_{I \times J} w^{\gamma}(x,y)\, dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\iint_{I \times J} s^{\gamma}(x,y) \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} < \infty. \tag{7.2}$$

From the assumption $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \alpha$ we obtain that

$$0 < \gamma_0 \equiv \frac{1-\alpha}{\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'}} < 1,$$

and hence that

$$\gamma_0 \left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} \right) = 1 - \alpha < \gamma_0 \left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} \right) + (1 - \gamma_0) \min \left\{ \frac{1}{q}, \frac{1}{p'} \right\}.$$

By continuity we can choose $\gamma < \gamma_0$ so that

$$\gamma \left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} \right) < 1 - \alpha < \gamma \left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} \right) + (1 - \gamma) \min \left\{ \frac{1}{q}, \frac{1}{p'} \right\},$$

which we rewrite as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma}{q} + \frac{\gamma}{p'} &< 1 - \alpha < \frac{1}{q} + \frac{\gamma}{p'}, \\ \frac{\gamma}{q} + \frac{\gamma}{p'} &< 1 - \alpha < \frac{\gamma}{q} + \frac{1}{p'}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

With the restriction (7.3) on the choice of γ we will now prove (7.2).

First suppose that $R = I \times J$ contains $(0,0)$ and satisfies $R \cap \mathcal{P} = \left\{ \left(2^{k}, 2^{-k}\right) \right\}_{k=K+1}^{K+N}$ for some $K \geq 0$. The worst case is when $I = \left[0, 2^{K+N}\right]$ and $J = \left[0, 2^{-(K+1)}\right]$, which we now suppose holds. We will use the following four interval estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{0}^{2^{T}} \left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} dx \approx \sum_{N=1}^{T} \int_{2^{N-\frac{1}{2}}}^{2^{N+\frac{1}{2}}} \left|\frac{x}{2^{N}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} dx = \sum_{N=1}^{T} 2^{-N(\gamma-1)} \int_{2^{N-\frac{1}{2}}}^{2^{N+\frac{1}{2}}} \left|x - 2^{N}\right|^{\gamma-1} dx \\ \approx \quad &\sum_{N=1}^{T} 2^{-N(\gamma-1)} 2^{N\gamma} \approx \sum_{N=1}^{T} 2^{N(-(\gamma-1)+\gamma)} \approx \sum_{N=1}^{T} 2^{N} \approx 2^{T}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_0^{2^T} \left(2^{M(x)} \left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}} - 1\right|\right)^{\gamma-1} dx \approx \sum_{N=1}^{T} 2^{N(\gamma-1)} 2^N \approx \sum_{N=1}^{T} 2^{N\gamma} \approx 2^{T\gamma},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{2^{-T}} \left|\frac{y}{2^{-L(y)}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} dy \approx \sum_{N=T}^{\infty} \int_{2^{-\left(N-\frac{1}{2}\right)}}^{2^{-\left(N+\frac{1}{2}\right)}} \left|\frac{y}{2^{-N}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} dy \\
= &\sum_{N=T}^{\infty} 2^{N(\gamma-1)} \int_{2^{-\left(N-\frac{1}{2}\right)}}^{2^{-\left(N+\frac{1}{2}\right)}} \left|y - 2^{-N}\right|^{\gamma-1} dy \approx \sum_{N=T}^{\infty} 2^{N(\gamma-1)} 2^{-N\gamma} \approx \sum_{N=T}^{\infty} 2^{-N} \approx 2^{-T},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_0^{2^{-T}} 2^{-L(y)(\gamma-1)} dy \approx \sum_{N=T}^{\infty} 2^{-N(\gamma-1)} 2^{-N} \approx \sum_{N=T}^{\infty} 2^{-N\gamma} \approx 2^{-\gamma T}.$$

Define $R_{M,L} \equiv I_M \times J_L = \left[2^{M-\frac{1}{2}}, 2^{M+\frac{1}{2}}\right] \times \left[2^{-\left(L+\frac{1}{2}\right)}, 2^{-\left(L-\frac{1}{2}\right)}\right]$. We will also use the following three rectangle estimates,

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint\limits_{R_{M,M}} w^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy &\approx \int_{I_M}\int_{J_M} \left(\left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}} - 1\right| \left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho L(y)}} - 1\right|\right)^{\gamma-1} dxdy \\
&\approx \left(\int_{I_M} \left|\frac{x}{2^M} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} dx\right)\left(\int_{J_M} \left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho M}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} dy\right) \\
&\approx \left(2^{-M(\gamma-1)} 2^{M\gamma}\right)\left(2^{M(\gamma-1)} 2^{-M\gamma}\right) = 1;
\end{aligned}$$

and for $M < L$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint\limits_{R_{M,L}} w^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy &\approx \int_{I_M}\int_{J_L} \left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} dxdy + \int_{I_M}\int_{J_L} \left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho L(y)}} - 1\right|^{\gamma-1} dxdy \\
&\approx 2^M 2^{-L} + 2^M 2^{-L} = 2^{M-L},
\end{aligned}$$

and for $M > L$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint\limits_{R_{M,L}} w_{\rho}^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy &\approx \int_{I_M}\int_{J_L} \left(2^M \left|\frac{x}{2^M} - 1\right|\right)^{\gamma-1} 2^{-L(\gamma-1)} dxdy \\
&\quad + \int_{I_M}\int_{J_L} 2^{M(\gamma-1)} \left(2^{-L} \left|\frac{y}{2^{-L}} - 1\right|\right)^{\gamma-1} dxdy \\
&\approx 2^{M\gamma} 2^{-\gamma L} + 2^{M\gamma} 2^{-L(\gamma-1)} 2^{-\gamma L} \approx 2^{(M-L)\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Altogether we have

$$\iint\limits_{R_{M,L}} w_{\rho}^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy \approx \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad M = L \\ 2^{M-L} & \text{if} \quad M < L \\ 2^{(M-L)\gamma} & \text{if} \quad M > L \end{cases}.$$

It now follows with $I = \left[0, 2^{K+N}\right]$ and $J = \left[0, 2^{-\rho(K+1)}\right]$ as above that

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint_{I\times J} w^\gamma(x,y)\,dxdy &\approx \iint_{[0,2^K]\times[0,2^{-\rho K}]} w^\gamma + \iint_{[2^K,2^{K+N}]\times[0,2^{-\rho K}]} w^\gamma \approx \sum_{M=1}^{K}\sum_{L=K}^{\infty}\iint_{R_{M,L}} w^\gamma + \sum_{M=K}^{K+N}\sum_{L=K}^{\infty}\iint_{R_{M,L}} w^\gamma \\
&\approx \sum_{M=1}^{K}\sum_{L=K}^{\infty}\iint_{R_{M,L}} w^\gamma + \sum_{M=K}^{K+N}\iint_{R_{M,M}} w^\gamma + \sum_{M=K}^{K+N}\sum_{L=M}^{\infty}\iint_{R_{M,L}} w^\gamma + \sum_{M=K}^{K+N}\sum_{L=K}^{M}\iint_{R_{M,L}} w^\gamma \\
&\approx \sum_{M=1}^{K}\sum_{L=K}^{\infty} 2^{M-L} + \sum_{M=K}^{K+N} 1 + \sum_{M=K}^{K+N}\sum_{L=M+1}^{\infty} 2^{M-L} + \sum_{M=K}^{K+N}\sum_{L=K}^{M-1} 2^{(M-L)\gamma} \\
&\approx 1 + N + N + 2^{N\gamma} \approx 2^{N\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\alpha-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J} w^\gamma(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I\times J} s^\gamma(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
\lesssim\ & \left(2^{K+N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{-(K+1)}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{N\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_0^{2^{K+N}} x^{\gamma-1}dx\int_0^{2^{-\rho(K+1)}} y^{\gamma-1}dy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
\lesssim\ & \left(2^{K+N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{-(K+1)}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{N\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(2^{(K+N)\gamma}2^{-(K+1)\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \approx 2^{N\left(\alpha-1+\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}\right)},
\end{aligned}$$

which is uniformly bounded over all such rectangles $R = I \times J$ since

$$\alpha - 1 + \frac{\gamma}{q} + \frac{\gamma}{p'} \le 0$$

holds by (7.3).

We must now complete the check that $\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,\alpha}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma) < \infty$ by considering the remaining rectangles R. First let us suppose that $R = [0,a]\times[0,b]$ with $0 < a, b < 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\alpha-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J} w^\gamma(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I\times J} s^\gamma(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
\lesssim\ & a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}\left(\int_0^a\left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}dx\int_0^b dy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}(a^\gamma b^\gamma)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
&+a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}\left(\int_0^a dx\int_0^b\left(\left|\frac{y}{2^{-L(y)}}-1\right|\right)^{\gamma-1}dy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}(a^\gamma b^\gamma)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
\approx\ & a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}a^{\frac{1}{q}}b^{\frac{1}{q}}a^{\frac{\gamma}{p'}}b^{\frac{\gamma}{p'}} + a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}a^{\frac{1}{q}}b^{\frac{1}{q}}a^{\frac{\gamma}{p'}}b^{\frac{\gamma}{p'}} \approx a^{\alpha-1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}}\ b^{\alpha-1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The final expression above is uniformly bounded for $0 < a, b < 1$ since

$$1 - \alpha \le \frac{1}{q} + \frac{\gamma}{p'}, \tag{7.4}$$

which holds by (7.3).

Now suppose that $R = [0,a] \times [0,b]$ with $1 < a < \infty$ and $0 < b < \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{a}\right\}$ so that R lies beneath the hyperbola $\mathcal{H}$ and includes the origin. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\alpha-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J} w^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I\times J} s^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
\lesssim\ & a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}\left(\int_0^a \left|\frac{x}{2^{M(x)}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}dx\int_0^b dy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}(a^{\gamma}b^{\gamma})^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&+a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}\left(\int_0^a dx\int_0^b \left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho L(y)}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}dy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}(a^{\gamma}b^{\gamma})^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
\approx\ & a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}a^{\frac{1}{q}}b^{\frac{1}{q}}a^{\frac{\gamma}{p'}}b^{\frac{\gamma}{p'}} = a^{\alpha-1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}}\ b^{\alpha-1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is uniformly bounded for $1 < a < \infty$ and $0 < b < \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{a}\right\}$ since

$$\alpha - 1 + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{\gamma}{p'} \geq 0,$$

which is inequality (7.4), and since

$$a^{\alpha-1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}}\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)^{\alpha-1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}} = 1$$

is bounded for $1 < a < \infty$.

Now we check yet a final family of rectangles, namely the case $R = I \times J = \left[2^N - a, 2^N + a\right] \times \left[2^{-N} - b, 2^{-N} + b\right]$ with $0 < a, b < \infty$. When $a < 2^{N-1}$ and $b < 2^{-(N+1)}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\alpha-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J} w^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I\times J} s^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
\lesssim\ & a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}\left(\int_{2^N-a}^{2^N+a}\left|\frac{x}{2^N}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}dx\int_{2^{-N}-b}^{2^{-N}+b}\left|\frac{y}{2^{-N}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}dy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_{2^N-a}^{2^N+a}|x|^{\gamma-1}dx\int_{2^{-N}-b}^{2^{-N}+b}|y|^{\gamma-1}dy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
\approx\ & a^{\alpha-1}b^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{N(1-\gamma)}a^{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(2^{-N(1-\gamma)}b^{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(2^{N(\gamma-1)}a2^{-N(\gamma-1)}b\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \approx a^{\alpha-1+\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}\ b^{\alpha-1+\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This final expression is uniformly bounded for $0 < a < 1$ and $0 < b < 2^{-\rho(N+1)}$ with N fixed, since

$$1 - \alpha \leq \frac{\gamma}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} \tag{7.5}$$

holds by (7.3). The final expression is then also uniformly bounded for $1 < a < 2^{N-1}$ and $b < 2^{-(N+1)}$ and all $N \geq 1$ since

$$2^{N\left(\alpha-1+\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}\right)}\ 2^{-N\left(\alpha-1+\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}\right)} = 1.$$

At last we consider the extreme case when $I\times J=\left[2^N-a,2^N+a\right]\times\left[0,2^{-(N+1)}\right]$ with $0<a<2^{N-1}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\alpha-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J}s^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\iint_{I\times J}w^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
\lesssim\ & a^{\alpha-1}2^{-N(\alpha-1)}\left(\int_{2^N-a}^{2^N+a}x^{\gamma-1}dx\int_0^{2^{-(N+1)}}y^{\gamma-1}dy\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&\times\left(\int_{2^N-a}^{2^N+a}\int_0^{2^{-(N+1)}}\left[\left|\frac{x}{2^N}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}+\left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho L(y)}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}\right]dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
\approx\ & a^{\alpha-1}2^{-N(\alpha-1)}\left(2^{N(\gamma-1)}a2^{-N\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(2^{N(1-\gamma)}a^{\gamma}2^{-N}+a2^{-N}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
=\ & a^{\alpha-1}2^{-N(\alpha-1)}\left(2^{N(\gamma-1)}a2^{-N\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(a^{\gamma}2^{-N\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}+a^{\alpha-1}b^{\beta-1}\left(2^{N(\gamma-1)}a2^{-N\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(a2^{-N}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
\approx\ & 2^{-N\frac{1}{p'}}2^{-N\frac{\gamma}{q}}a^{\alpha-1}2^{-N(\alpha-1)}a^{\frac{\gamma}{q}}a^{\frac{1}{p'}}+2^{-N\frac{1}{p'}}a^{\alpha-1}2^{-N(\alpha-1)}2^{-N\frac{1}{q}}a^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}\\
=\ & 2^{-N\left(\frac{1}{p'}+\frac{\gamma}{q}+(\alpha-1)\right)}a^{\alpha-1+\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}+2^{-N\left(\frac{1}{p'}+(\alpha-1)+\frac{1}{q}\right)}a^{\alpha-1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The exponents of a above are positive since we already have $\alpha-1+\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}\geq 0$ from (7.3), and $\alpha-1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}$ is even bigger. Since $a<2^N$, we have uniform boundedness in a and N as well.

The remaining rectangles R turn out to require no further restrictions. Indeed, given any rectangle $R=I\times J$, we will now verify, albeit somewhat tediously, that there is a rectangle $R'=I'\times J'$ from one of the families of rectangles considered above, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}\left(I\times J;(s^{\gamma},w^{\gamma})\right)\ &\equiv\ |I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\alpha-1}\left(\iint_{I\times J}w^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I\times J}s^{\gamma}(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&\lesssim\ |I'|^{\alpha-1}|J'|^{\alpha-1}\left(\iint_{I'\times J'}w^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I'\times J'}s^{\gamma}(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For this, we begin with some elementary facts on the real line. The function $\varphi_{\gamma}(t)\equiv\frac{1-t^{\gamma}}{1-t}$ is convex decreasing on $(0,\infty)$ for $0<\gamma<1$, and satisfies $\lim_{t\to 1}\varphi_{\gamma}(t)=\gamma$ by l'Hôspital's rule, and so in particular we have

$$\gamma<\varphi_{\gamma}(t)=\frac{1-t^{\gamma}}{1-t}<1\text{ for }0<t<1.$$

The case $-A<r<R<A$: Define the function

$$\begin{aligned}
F_A^{\gamma}(r,R)\ &\equiv\ |(r,R)|^{\alpha-1}\left(\int_r^R|x-A|^{\gamma-1}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_r^R|x+A|^{\gamma-1}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&=\ (R-r)^{\alpha-1}\frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}}}\left[(A-r)^{\gamma}-(A-R)^{\gamma}\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{p'}}}\left[(A+R)^{\gamma}-(A+r)^{\gamma}\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&=\ \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\left[\frac{(A-r)^{\gamma}-(A-R)^{\gamma}}{(A-r)-(A-R)}\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\left[\frac{(A+R)^{\gamma}-(A+r)^{\gamma}}{(A+R)-(A+r)}\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&=\ \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}(A+R)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{\gamma-1}\left[\frac{1-\left(\frac{A-R}{A-r}\right)^{\gamma}}{1-\frac{A-R}{A-r}}\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\left[\frac{1-\left(\frac{A+r}{A+R}\right)^{\gamma}}{1-\frac{A+r}{A+R}}\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&=\ \frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}(A+R)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}}\varphi_{\gamma}\left(\frac{A-R}{A-r}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\varphi_{\gamma}\left(\frac{A+r}{A+R}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have the approximation

$$F_A^\gamma(r,R) \approx \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}(A+R)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}}.$$

Thus for $A-r=\delta \ll 1$, we have

$$F_A^\gamma(A-\delta,R) \lesssim \frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{\delta^{\frac{1}{q}}A^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}} = \delta^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}A^{\frac{\gamma-1}{p'}},$$

while if $A+R=\delta \ll 1$, we have

$$F_A^\gamma(r,\delta-A) \lesssim \frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{A^{\frac{1}{q}}\delta^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}} = \delta^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}A^{\frac{\gamma-1}{q}},$$

and altogether, we see that $F_A^\gamma(r,R)$ tends to zero as either $r \nearrow A$ or $R \searrow -A$ by (7.3):

$$\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'} < 1-\alpha < \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'},\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}\right\}. \tag{7.6}$$

Now we compute monotonicity properties of the function

$$G_A^\gamma(r,R) \equiv \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}(A+R)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
G_A^\gamma(r,R) &= \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}(R-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{(A-r)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}(A+R)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}} \\
&= \left\{\left(\frac{R-r}{A-r}\right)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}(R-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}\right\}\frac{1}{(A+R)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}} \\
&= \left\{\left(1-\frac{A-R}{A-r}\right)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}(R-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}\right\}\frac{1}{(A+R)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is clearly decreasing in r on the interval $(-A,R)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_A^\gamma(r,R) &= \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}(R-r)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}}{(A-r)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}(R+A)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}} \\
&= \frac{1}{(A-r)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}}\left\{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}\left(\frac{R-r}{R+A}\right)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}\right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{(A-r)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}}\left\{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}\left(1-\frac{r+A}{R+A}\right)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which is clearly increasing in R on the interval (r,A). Thus the function $G_A^\gamma(r,R)$ increases away from the diagonal in each coordinate direction, and it follows that the maximum is achieved on the boundary, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
G_A^\gamma(r,A) &= \frac{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}(2A)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}} = \frac{(A-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{(2A)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}}, \\
G_A^\gamma(-A,R) &= \frac{(R+A)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(2A)^{\frac{1}{q}}(A+R)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}} = \frac{(R+A)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{(2A)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is now clear that the maximum is achieved at $(-A, A)$, and that the maximum value of G_A^γ under the above restrictions is

$$G_A^\gamma(-A, A) = (2A)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}.$$

Note that this tends to zero as $A \nearrow \infty$.

The case $r < -A < R < A$: This time we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_A^\gamma(r,R) &\equiv |(r,R)|^{\alpha-1}\left(\int_r^R |x-A|^{\gamma-1}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\left\{\int_r^{-A}+\int_{-A}^R\right\}|x+A|^{\gamma-1}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= (R-r)^{\alpha-1}\frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}}}\left[(A-r)^\gamma-(A-R)^\gamma\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{p'}}}\left[|R+A|^\gamma+|r+A|^\gamma\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\left[\frac{(A-r)^\gamma-(A-R)^\gamma}{(A-r)-(A-R)}\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\left[\frac{|A+R|^\gamma+|A+r|^\gamma}{|A+R|+|A+r|}\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}|A+R|^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{\gamma-1}\left[\frac{1-\left(\frac{A-R}{A-r}\right)^\gamma}{1-\frac{A-R}{A-r}}\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\left[\frac{1+\left|\frac{A+r}{A+R}\right|^\gamma}{1+\left|\frac{A+r}{A+R}\right|}\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}|A+R|^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}}\varphi_\gamma\left(\frac{A-R}{A-r}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left[\frac{1+\left|\frac{A+r}{A+R}\right|^\gamma}{1+\left|\frac{A+r}{A+R}\right|}\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}},
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
F_A^\gamma(r,R) &\approx \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}|A+R|^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}}\max\left\{1,\left|\frac{A+r}{A+R}\right|^{\frac{\gamma-1}{p'}}\right\}\\
&= \frac{(|A+R|+|A+r|)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{(A-r)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}}\max\left\{|A+R|^{\frac{\gamma-1}{p'}},|A+r|^{\frac{\gamma-1}{p'}}\right\}\\
&\approx \frac{(|A+R|+|A+r|)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{(A-r)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}}(|A+R|+|A+r|)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{p'}}\\
&= \frac{(|A+R|+|A+r|)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{(2A+|A+r|)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus in this case we define

$$G_A^\gamma(r,R) \equiv \frac{(|A+R|+|A+r|)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{(2A+|A+r|)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}}.$$

Note that $G_A^\gamma(r,R)$ is increasing in R on the interval $(-A,A)$ so that

$$G_A^\gamma(r,R) \le G_A^\gamma(r,A) = \frac{(2A+|A+r|)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{(2A+|A+r|)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}} = (2A+|A+r|)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)},$$

which is at most

$$G_A^\gamma(-A,A) = (2A)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)},$$

and decays like the negative power $\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)$ of $A-r$ as $r \searrow -\infty$. Note also that for each fixed $R \in (-A,A)$, $G_A^\gamma(r,R)$ is decreasing in $|A+r|$ for $-\infty < r < -A$. Similar conclusions hold for the case $-A < r < A < R$.

The case $r < R < -A$: This time we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_A^\gamma(r,R) &\equiv |(r,R)|^{\alpha-1}\left(\int_r^R |x-A|^{\gamma-1}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\int_r^R |x+A|^{\gamma-1}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= (R-r)^{\alpha-1}\frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}}}\left[(A-r)^\gamma-(A-R)^\gamma\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{p'}}}\left[|A+r|^\gamma-|A+R|^\gamma\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\left[\frac{(A-r)^\gamma-(A-R)^\gamma}{(A-r)-(A-R)}\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\left[\frac{|A+r|^\gamma-|A+R|^\gamma}{|A+r|-|A+R|}\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= \frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}|A+r|^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{\gamma-1}\left[\frac{1-\left(\frac{A-R}{A-r}\right)^\gamma}{1-\frac{A-R}{A-r}}\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\left[\frac{1-\left|\frac{A+R}{A+r}\right|^\gamma}{1-\left|\frac{A+R}{A+r}\right|}\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}}\frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}|A+r|^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}}\varphi_\gamma\left(\frac{A-R}{A-r}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\varphi_\gamma\left(\left|\frac{A+R}{A+r}\right|\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$F_A^\gamma(r,R)\approx\frac{(R-r)^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}}{\left\{(A-r)^{\frac{1}{q}}|A+r|^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{1-\gamma}}=(R-r)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}\left(\frac{R-r}{A-r}\right)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{q}}\left(\frac{R-r}{|A+r|}\right)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{p'}}.$$

From these calculations it is now easy to see that if $s^\gamma(x,y)=|x|^{\gamma-1}|y|^{\gamma-1}$ and $w_N^\gamma(x,y)=\left|x-2^N\right|^{\gamma-1}\left|y-2^{-N}\right|^{\gamma-1}$, then with

$$S_N\equiv\left[0,2^N\right]\times\left[0,2^{-N}\right],$$

we have for any rectangle $R=I\times J$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma,w_N^\gamma)) &\lesssim \mathcal{A}(S_N;(s^\gamma,w_N^\gamma))\\
&\approx \left(2^N\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}\left(2^{-N}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'}-(1-\alpha)}=1
\end{aligned}$$

is bounded in $N\geq 1$. We can also easily deduce montonicity properties for $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma,w_N^\gamma))$ that follow from the one variable monontonicity properties above.

With these estimates in hand, we can now complete our proof in four steps.

Step 1: We claim that it suffices to consider rectangles R contained in the horizontal strip $[0,\infty)\times[0,1]$.

Proof. Let P denote the bottom left vertex of the rectangle R and let Q denote the upper left vertex of the rectangle R. If P lies below the x-axis $y=0$, then we can **translate** the rectangle R vertically upward until P lies on the x-axis $y=0$ without decreasing $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma,w_N^\gamma))$ by more than a fixed positive factor. This is because all of poles of the weights s^γ and w_N^γ lie on or above the x-axis $y=0$. Now if in this translated rectangle, the upper left vertex Q lies above the horizontal line $y=1$, we can **shrink** the rectangle R vertically, keeping the bottom edge fixed on the x-axis, and only shifting the top edge downward until the top edge lies on the line $y=1$, again without decreasing $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma,w_N^\gamma))$ by more than a fixed positive factor. This is because of the estimates proved above and since all of the poles of the weights s^γ and w_N^γ lie on or below the horizontal line $y=1$.

Similarly, if Q lies above the horizontal line $y=1$, then we can translate R vertically downward until Q lies on the horizontal line $y=1$ without decreasing $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma,w_N^\gamma))$ by more than a fixed positive factor. This is because all of poles of the weights s^γ and w_N^γ lie on or below the horizontal line $y=1$. Then if in this translated rectangle, the lower left vertex P lies below the x-axis, we can **shrink** the rectangle R vertically, keeping the upper edge fixed on the horizontal line $y=1$, and only shifting the bottom edge upward until the bottom edge lies on the x-axis, again without decreasing $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma,w_N^\gamma))$ by more than a fixed positive factor. This is because of the estimates proved above and since all of the poles of the weights s^γ and w_N^γ lie on or above the x-axis $y=0$.

Thus at this point we have shown that we may assume the rectangle R lies in the doubly infinite horiontal strip $(-\infty,\infty)\times[0,1]$. If the left edge of R lies to the left of the y-axis $x=0$, then we may shrink the rectangle horizontally, keeping the right edge fixed and only shifting the left edge until it lies on the y-axis

$x = 0$, all without decreasing $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma, w_N^\gamma))$ by more than a fixed positive factor. This is because of the estimates proved above and since all of the poles of the weights s^γ and w_N^γ lie on or to the right of the y-axix $x = 0$. Thus we have repeatedly shifted and shrunk the rectangle R to a rectangle R' that is contained in the horizontal strip $[0,\infty) \times [0,1]$ and satsifies

$$\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma, w_N^\gamma)) \leq C\mathcal{A}(R';(s^\gamma, w_N^\gamma)),$$

for a constant depending only on the indices $p, q, \alpha, \beta, m, n, \gamma$. □

Step 2: We claim that it suffices to consider only rectangles R contained in the horizontal strip $[0,\infty) \times [0,1]$ that also contain at least one of the poles from $\{(0,0)\} \cup \mathcal{P} = \left\{(0,0), (1,1), \left(2, 2^{-1}\right), ..., \left(2^N, 2^{-N}\right), ...\right\}$.

Proof. If $R \subset [0,\infty) \times [0,1]$ doesn't contain any poles, then we can expand R by moving each edge in succession outward until either it hits a pole or hits a boundary edge of $[0,\infty) \times [0,1]$, all without decreasing $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma, w_N^\gamma))$ by more than a fixed positive factor. This is because of the estimates proved above for intervals not containing one of the poles at $\pm A$. □

Step 3: If $R \subset [0,\infty) \times [0,1]$ contains **exactly** one pole, then $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma, w_N^\gamma)) \leq C\mathcal{A}(R';(s^\gamma, w_N^\gamma))$ for some R' already considered in one of the families above.

Proof. This is easily verified by inspection, considering the case where the pole is $(0,0)$ separately from the case where the pole is $\left(2^N, 2^{-N}\right)$ for some $N \geq 1$. □

Step 4: If $R \subset [0,\infty) \times [0,1]$ contains **more** than one pole, then $\mathcal{A}(R;(s^\gamma, w_N^\gamma)) \leq C\mathcal{A}(R';(s^\gamma, w_N^\gamma))$ for some R' already considered in one of the families above.

Proof. Suppose first that R contains $(0,0)$. If in addition R contains the consecutive points

$$\left(2^{L+1}, 2^{-(L+1)}\right), ... \left(2^{L+N}, 2^{-(L+N)}\right),$$

then we can compare R favourably with the corresponding rectangle considered above. Now suppose that R doesn't contain $(0,0)$. Then if $R = I \times J$ contains the consecutive points $\left(2^{L+1}, 2^{-(L+1)}\right), ... \left(2^{L+N}, 2^{-(L+N)}\right)$, we can compare R favourably with a corresponding rectangle considered above. □

This completes the proof that $\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,\alpha}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma) < \infty$.

Finally we note that since both weights s^γ, w^γ satisfy the product $A_1 \times A_1$ condition, hence also the product reverse doubling condition, it follows from Lemma 7 in the Appendix that $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{\alpha,\alpha}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma) \approx \mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,\alpha}(s^\gamma, w^\gamma)$.

7.3. **Failure of the strong type inequality for $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}$.** Assume the index γ satisfies (7.3). Now we take $0 < \tau, \eta < 1$ such that

$$\max\{\gamma, (1-\eta)p, 1-\gamma\} < \tau \leq \eta < \infty, \tag{7.7}$$

and define the function

$$f_{\eta,\tau}(x,y) \equiv x^{\eta-1} y^{\tau-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_*}(x,y),$$

where $\mathcal{H}_* \equiv \{(x,y) \in (1,\infty) \times (0,1) : xy \leq 1\}$. Now $f_{\eta,\tau} \in L^p(s^\gamma)$ if and only if $\iint f_{\eta,\tau}^p s^\gamma$ is finite where

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint f_{\eta,\tau}^p s^\gamma &= \int_1^\infty \left(\int_0^{\frac{1}{x}} y^{(\eta-1)p} y^\tau \frac{dy}{y} \right) x^{(\eta-1)p} x^{\gamma-1} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{(\eta-1)p+\tau} \int_1^\infty \left(\frac{1}{x}\right)^{(\eta-1)p+\tau} x^{p\eta-p+\gamma-1} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{(\eta-1)p+\tau} \int_1^\infty x^{\gamma-\tau} \frac{dx}{x} \\
&\approx \frac{1}{(\eta-1)p+\tau} \frac{1}{\tau-\gamma},
\end{aligned}$$

since both

$$(\eta-1)p + \tau > 0 \text{ and } \gamma - \tau < 0$$

hold by (7.7).

On the other hand, the strong dyadic fractional maximal function $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}\left(f_{\eta,\tau}s^{\gamma}\right)$ satisfies for $(u,v)\in\left[0,2^{N}\right)\times\left[0,2^{-N}\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}\left(f_{\eta,\tau}s^{\gamma}\right)(u,v) &\geq \left|\left(0,2^{N}\right)\right|^{\alpha-1}\left|\left(0,2^{-N}\right)\right|^{\alpha-1}\iint_{[0,2^{N})\times[0,2^{-N})} f_{\eta,\tau}s^{\gamma}\\ &= \int_{1}^{2^{N}}\int_{0}^{2^{-N}} x^{\eta-1}y^{\tau-1}x^{\gamma-1}y^{\gamma-1}dxdy\\ &\approx \left(\frac{1}{\tau-1+\gamma}\frac{1}{\eta-1+\gamma}\right)2^{N(\eta-1+\gamma)}2^{-N(\tau-1+\gamma)}\\ &\approx 2^{N(\eta-\tau)},\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

for all $N\geq 1$ since both

$$\eta-1+\gamma>0 \text{ and } \tau-1+\gamma>0$$

hold by (7.7).

Now we calculate a lower bound for the strong type operator norm of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}$. We note that with

$$\begin{aligned}R_{N,N} &\equiv I_N\times J_N\equiv\left[2^{N-\frac{1}{2}},2^{N}\right]\times\left[2^{-\left(N+\frac{1}{2}\right)},2^{-N}\right],\\ \mathcal{H}^{\natural} &\equiv \left\{(x,y):\ 1\leq x<\infty,\frac{1}{2}\leq xy\leq 1\right\},\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\overset{\cdot}{\bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty}}R_N\subset\mathcal{H}^{\natural}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}|R_{N,N}|_{w^{\gamma}} &= \iint_{\left\{(x,y):\ 2^{N-\frac{1}{2}}\leq x\leq 2^{N},2^{-\left(N+\frac{1}{2}\right)}\leq y\leq 2^{-N}\right\}} w^{\gamma}(x,y)\,dxdy\\ &\approx \int_{\{x\approx 2^{N}\}}\int_{\{y\approx 2^{-N}\}}\left|\frac{x}{2^{N}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}\left|\frac{y}{2^{-\rho N}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}dxdy\\ &\approx \int_{\{x\approx 2^{N}\}}\left|\frac{x}{2^{N}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}dx\int_{\{y\approx 2^{-N}\}}\left|\frac{y}{2^{-N}}-1\right|^{\gamma-1}dy\\ &\approx 2^{-N(\gamma-1)}2^{N\gamma}2^{N(\gamma-1)}2^{-N\gamma}=1.\end{aligned}$$

We also recall the estimate (7.8),

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}\left(f_{\eta,\tau}s\right)(x,y)\approx 2^{N(\eta-\tau)},\qquad (x,y)\in R_N\ .$$

Thus we compute

$$\int_{\mathcal{H}^{\natural}}\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}\left(f_{\eta,\tau}s\right)(x,y)^{q}\ w^{\gamma}(x,y)\ dxdy\gtrsim\sum_{N=1}^{\infty}2^{N\theta q}=\infty$$

since $\eta\geq\tau$ by (7.7).

So altogether we have

$$f_{\eta,\tau}\in L^{p}\left(s^{\gamma}\right)\text{ and }\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\alpha}^{\mathrm{dy}}\left(f_{\eta,\tau}s^{\gamma}\right)\notin L^{q}\left(w^{\gamma}\right)\ , \tag{7.9}$$

under the assumptions that $0<\gamma,\eta<1$ and

$$\eta\geq\tau>\max\left\{\gamma,(1-\eta)\,p,1-\gamma\right\}. \tag{7.10}$$

Recall also that we have $A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\alpha}\left(s^{\gamma},w_{\rho}^{\gamma}\right)<\infty$ under the assumptions that $0<\gamma<1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'} &< 1-\alpha<\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'},\\ \frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{\gamma}{p'} &< 1-\alpha<\frac{\gamma}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}.\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

Thus in order to obtain a counterexample for given indices $1 < p, q < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ that satisfy $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \alpha$, we need only find indices γ, η, τ that simultaneously satisfy (7.10) and (7.11). Since $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \alpha$, we can find γ satisfying (7.11) as shown above, and moreover, the argument given earlier shows that we may assume γ is arbitrarily close to but less than $\gamma_0 = \frac{1-\alpha}{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}$. Since $1 - \alpha < \gamma_0 < 1$ we can arrange to have $1 - \alpha < \gamma < 1$ as well as (7.11). Then we choose τ so that $\max\{\gamma, 1-\gamma\} < \tau < 1$, and finally we choose $0 < \eta < 1$ so close to 1 that we have $(1-\eta)\, p < \tau \leq \eta$. This completes the proof of Theorem 7.

8. Proof of Theorems 8 and 9

We begin with the somewhat lengthy proof of Theorem 8. Then we give the short proofs of Corollary 3 and Proposition 2, all of which are then used to prove our main positive two weight result, Theorem 9.

8.1. **Proof of Theorem 8.** Let $I = \prod_{i=1}^{m} [a_i, a_i + s]$ and $J = \prod_{j=1}^{n} [b_j, b_j + t]$ be cubes in $\mathbb{R}^m_+$ and $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ with side lengths $s > 0$ and $t > 0$ respectively. Then the local characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] \\ = \;& s^{\alpha-m}\, t^{\beta-n} \left(\int_{[a,a+s]^m} \int_{[b,b+t]^n} |(x,y)|^{-\gamma q}\, dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\int_{[a,a+s]^m} \int_{[b,b+t]^n} |(x,y)|^{-\delta p'}\, dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ = \;& s^{\alpha-m}\, t^{\beta-n} \left[\mathcal{I}^{m,n}_{\{a,b\};(s,t)}(-\gamma q) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\mathcal{I}^{m,n}_{\{a,b\};(s,t)}(-\delta p') \right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^{m,n}_{(a,b);(s,t)}(\eta) \;&\equiv\; \int_{\prod_{i=1}^{m}[a_i,a_i+s]} \int_{\prod_{j=1}^{n}[b_j,b_j+t]} |(x,y)|^{\eta}\, dxdy = \int_{\prod_{i=1}^{m}[a_i,a_i+s]} \int_{\prod_{j=1}^{n}[b_j,b_j+t]} \left(|x|^2 + |y|^2 \right)^{\frac{\eta}{2}} dxdy \\ &\approx\; \int_{\prod_{i=1}^{m}[a_i,a_i+s]} \int_{\prod_{j=1}^{n}[b_j,b_j+t]} (x_1 + ... + x_m + y_1 + ... + y_n)^{\eta}\, dxdy \equiv \mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{(a,b);(s,t)}(\eta), \end{aligned}$$

for $(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^m_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n_+$. Two immediate necessary conditions for the finiteness of $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ are the local integrability (4.12) of the weights w^q and $v^{-p'}$, namely $\gamma q < m + n$ and $\delta p' < m + n$. Define the sans serif local characteristic $\mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J]$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] \;&\equiv\; s^{\alpha-m}\, t^{\beta-n} \left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{a,b\};(s,t)}(-\gamma q) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{a,b\};(s,t)}(-\delta p') \right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \\ \text{for} \qquad (a,b) \;&\in\; \mathbb{R}^m_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n_+ . \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

Symmetry considerations show that the characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ satisfies

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) \equiv \sup_{I\times J \subset \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] \approx \sup_{I\times J \subset \mathbb{R}^m_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n_+} \mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J].$$

Suppose that $I = \prod_{i=1}^{m} [a_i, a_i + s] \subset \mathbb{R}^m_+$ and $J = \prod_{j=1}^{n} [b_j, b_j + t] \subset \mathbb{R}^n_+$ are as above. If we slide (translate) the rectangle $I \times J$ to a new position

$$I' \times J' = \prod_{i=1}^{m} [a'_i, a'_i + s] \times \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left[b'_j, b'_j + t \right] \subset \mathbb{R}^m_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n_+$$

in which their centers

$$c_{I\times J} = (a,b), c_{I'\times J'} = (a',b') \in \mathbb{R}^m_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n_+$$

lie on the same simplex

$$S(\nu) \equiv \left\{ (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n_+ : x_1 + ... + x_m + y_1 + ... + y_n = \nu \right\}, \qquad \nu > 0,$$

then the sans serif local characteristics are unchanged, i.e.

$$\mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J]=\mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I',J'].$$

Thus it suffices to consider only rectangles $I\times J\subset\mathbb{R}_+^m\times\mathbb{R}_+^n$ having the special forms

$$I=[0,s]^{k-1}\times[a_k,a_k+s]\times[0,s]^{m-k}\text{ and }J=[0,t]^n, \tag{8.2}$$

and

$$I=[0,s]^m\text{ and }J=[0,t]^{\ell-1}\times[b_\ell,b_\ell+t]\times[0,t]^{n-\ell}, \tag{8.3}$$

for some $1\le k\le m$ and $1\le\ell\le n$. We have thus shown that the characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ is controlled by the supremum of the sans serif local characteristics $\mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J]$ taken over rectangles $I\times J$ of the special forms given in (8.2) and (8.3):

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\approx\sup_{I\times J\text{ as in (8.2) or (8.3)}}\mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J].$$

Let us further consider a rectangle $I\times J$ of the form (8.2), and without loss of generality, we may take $k=1$ so that

$$I=[a,a+s]\times[0,s]^{m-1}\text{ and }J=[0,t]^n.$$

Recall that the corresponding sans serif local characteristic is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J]\\ &=\ s^{\alpha-m}\,t^{\beta-n}\,\left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\gamma q)\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\,\left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\delta p')\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}},\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{0}=(0,...,0)\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and

$$\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0,),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(\eta)=\int_{x\in[a,a+s]\times[0,s]^{m-1}}\left\{\int_{y\in[0,t]^n}(x_1+...+x_m+y_1+...+y_n)^\eta\,dy\right\}dx.$$

(1) First we note that if $s\ge a>0$, then

$$\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0,),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(\eta)\approx\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\};s,t}(\eta),\qquad\eta\ge0,$$

and

$$\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0,),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(\eta)\lesssim\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\};s,t}(\eta),\qquad-(m+n)<\eta<0,$$

as is easily seen using the doubling and monotonicity properties of the locally integrable weight $(x_1+...+x_m+y_1+...+y_n)^\eta$. We conclude using (4.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}&s^{\alpha-m}\,t^{\beta-n}\,\left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\gamma q)\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\,\left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\delta p')\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\ &\lesssim s^{\alpha-m}\,t^{\beta-n}\,\left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\gamma q)\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\,\left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\delta p')\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}},\end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

holds when $s\ge a>0$.

(2) Now consider the case $0<s<a\le t$. Then by doubling and monotonicity we have

$$\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0,),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(\eta)\lesssim\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\};s,t}(\eta),\qquad-(m+n)<\eta<\infty,$$

and so we conclude again using (4.12) that (8.4) also holds when $0<s<a<t$.

(3) Now consider the remaining case $0<s,t\le a$. Since the weight $(x_1+...+x_m+y_1+...+y_n)^\eta$ is roughly equal to the constant a^η on the cube $[a,2a]\times[0,a]^{m-1}\times[0,a]^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left[[a,a+s]\times[0,s]^{m-1},[0,t]^n\right]\\ &=\ s^{\alpha-m1}\,t^{\beta-n}\,\left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0,),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\gamma q)\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\,\left[\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0,),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\delta p')\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\ &=\ s^{\alpha-m\Gamma}\,t^{\beta-n\Gamma}\,\left[\frac{1}{s^mt^n}\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0,),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\gamma q)\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\,\left[\frac{1}{s^mt^n}\mathsf{I}^{m,n}_{\{(a,0,...,0,),\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}(-\delta p')\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\ &\approx\ s^{\alpha-m\Gamma}\,t^{\beta-n\Gamma}\,a^{-(\gamma+\delta)},\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < s, t < a$. We note for future reference that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left[[a,a+s]\times[0,s]^{m-1},[0,t]^{n}\right] \\ \approx\ & \mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left[[a,a+s]^{m},[a,a+t]^{n}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $s = t = a$ in (3) we see that $a^{(\alpha+\beta)-(\gamma+\delta)-(m+n)\Gamma}$ must be bounded for all $a > 0$, which is equivalent to the balanced condition

$$\Gamma = \frac{(\alpha+\beta)-(\gamma+\delta)}{m+n}. \tag{8.5}$$

Now we also have that both $s^{\alpha-m\Gamma}$ and $t^{\beta-n\Gamma}$ are bounded for $0 < s, t \leq a$, which is equivalent to

$$\frac{\alpha}{m}, \frac{\beta}{n} \geq \Gamma.$$

If we fix $t = 1$ and let $s = a \to \infty$, we obtain that the boundedness of $a^{\alpha-m\Gamma}\ a^{-(\gamma+\delta)}$ for a large implies

$$\frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m}.$$

Similarly we have

$$\frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n},$$

from which we conclude the diagonal inequality

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma \leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} \\ \Gamma \leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} \end{cases}. \tag{8.6}$$

It is now an easy matter to verify that the supremum taken over $0 < s, t \leq a$ of the sans serif characteristics arising in (3), is finite if and only if both the power weight equality (8.5) and diagonal inequalities (8.6) hold, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0<s,t\leq a} \mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left[[a,a+s]\times[0,s]^{m-1},[0,t]^{n}\right] < \infty \\ \iff & \sup_{0<s,t<a} s^{\alpha-m\Gamma}\ t^{\beta-m\Gamma}\ a^{-(\gamma+\delta)} < \infty \\ \iff & \begin{cases} \Gamma = \frac{(\alpha+\beta)-(\gamma+\delta)}{m+n} \\ \Gamma \leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} \\ \Gamma \leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

If we combine this with the conclusions of (1) and (2), along with a similar analysis of the case when $I \times J$ has the form in (8.3), we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that $\alpha, \beta > 0$, $1 < p, q < \infty$, and $w(x,y) = |(x,y)|^{-\gamma}$ and $v(x,y) = |(x,y)|^{\delta}$ with $-\infty < \gamma, \delta < \infty$ that satisfy (4.12). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) \\ \approx\ & \sup_{0<s,t<\infty} \mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left[[0,s]^{m},[0,t]^{n}\right] \\ & + \sup_{0<s,t\leq a<\infty} \mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left[[a,a+s]^{m},[a,a+t]^{n}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second summand is finite if and only if $\begin{cases} \Gamma = \frac{(\alpha+\beta)-(\gamma+\delta)}{m+n} \\ \Gamma \leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} \\ \Gamma \leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} \end{cases}$.

8.1.1. *Rectangles at the origin.* It now remains to determine under what conditions on the indices the first summand is finite, i.e. when

$$\sup_{0<s,t<\infty} \mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left[[0,s]^m,[0,t]^n\right]<\infty.$$

For this we start with

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\left[[0,s]^m,[0,t]^n\right]\\ =\;& s^{\alpha-m}\,t^{\beta-n}\,\left[\mathsf{I}_{\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}^{m,n}(-\gamma q)\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}\,\left[\mathsf{I}_{\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}^{m,n}(-\delta p')\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\end{aligned}$$

where if $0<s\leq t<\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{I}_{\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\};(s,t)}^{m,n}(\eta) &= \int_{x\in[0,s]^m}\left\{\int_{y\in[0,t]^n}(\sigma_1+...+\sigma_m+\tau_1+...+\tau_n)^{\eta}\,d\tau_1...d\tau_n\right\}d\sigma_1...d\sigma_m\\ &\approx \int_0^s\left\{\int_0^t(\sigma+\tau)^{\eta}\;\tau^{n-1}d\tau\right\}\sigma^{m-1}d\sigma.\end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\int_0^{\lambda}(\rho+1)^{\eta}\,\rho^{m-1}d\rho\approx\begin{cases}\lambda^m & \text{if} \quad 0<\lambda\leq 1\\ \lambda^{(m+\eta)_+} & \text{if} \quad 1\leq\lambda<\infty \text{ and } m+\eta\neq 0\\ 1+\ln\lambda & \text{if} \quad 1\leq\lambda<\infty \text{ and } m+\eta=0\end{cases}.$$

Now suppose that $0<t\leq s<\infty$. Then we have with $x=x_+-x_-$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_{s,t}^{m,n}(\eta) &\approx \int_0^t\left\{\int_0^s(\sigma+\tau)^{\eta}\,\sigma^{m-1}d\sigma\right\}\tau^{n-1}d\tau\\ &= \int_0^t\left\{\int_{\sigma=0}^s\left(\frac{\sigma}{\tau}+1\right)^{\eta}\left(\frac{\sigma}{\tau}\right)^{m-1}d\left(\frac{\sigma}{\tau}\right)\right\}\tau^{\eta+m+n-1}d\tau\\ &= \int_0^t\left\{\int_{\sigma'=0}^{\frac{s}{\tau}}(\sigma'+1)^{\eta}\,(\sigma')^{m-1}\,d\sigma'\right\}\tau^{\eta+m+n-1}d\tau\\ &\approx \int_0^t\left(\frac{s}{\tau}\right)^{(m+\eta)_+}\tau^{\eta+m+n-1}d\tau=s^{(m+\eta)_+}\;t^{n-(m+\eta)_-}\;,\end{aligned}$$

provided $m+\eta\neq 0$ and $m+\eta>-n$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_{s,t}^{m,n}(-m) &\approx \int_0^t\left\{\int_{\sigma'=0}^{\frac{s}{\tau}}(\sigma'+1)^{-m}\,(\sigma')^{m-1}\,d\sigma'\right\}\tau^{n-1}d\tau\approx\int_0^t\left(\ln\frac{s}{\tau}\right)\tau^{n-1}d\tau\\ &= \frac{1}{n}t^n\ln s-\int_0^t(\ln\tau)\,\tau^{n-1}d\tau=\frac{1}{n}t^n\ln\frac{s}{t}+\frac{1}{n^2}t^n=\frac{t^n}{n}\left(\frac{1}{n}+\ln\frac{s}{t}\right),\end{aligned}$$

since $\int x^{n-1}\ln x\,dx=\frac{1}{n}x^n\ln x-\frac{1}{n^2}x^n$. It will be convenient to simply understand that

$$s^{0_+}\;t^{-0_-}=\ln\frac{s}{t}\text{ when }0<t\leq s<\infty.$$

Similarly, if $0<s\leq t<\infty$, then we have $\mathcal{I}_{s,t}^{m,n}(\eta)\approx s^{m-(n+\eta)_-}\;t^{(n+\eta)_+}$ provided $n+\eta>-m$, with the analogous understanding that $s^{-0_-}\;t^{0_+}=\ln\frac{t}{s}$, and so altogether we obtain

$$\mathcal{I}_{s,t}^{m,n}(\eta)\approx\begin{cases}s^{m-(n+\eta)_-}\;t^{(n+\eta)_+} & \text{if} \quad 0<s\leq t<\infty\\ s^{(m+\eta)_+}\;t^{n-(m+\eta)_-} & \text{if} \quad 0<t\leq s<\infty\end{cases},\qquad m+n+\eta>0.$$

Thus if $0 < s \leq t < \infty$ we have, using $m + n - \gamma q > 0$ and $m + n - \delta p' > 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
&A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m}\ t^{\beta-n}\ \mathcal{I}_{s,t}^{m,n}(-\gamma q)^{\frac{1}{q}}\ \mathcal{I}_{s,t}^{m,n}(-\delta p')^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
= &\ s^{\alpha-m}\ t^{\beta-n}\left(s^{m-(n-\gamma q)_-}\ t^{(n-\gamma q)_+}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(s^{m-\left(n-\delta p'\right)_-}\ t^{\left(n-\delta p'\right)_+}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
= &\ s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m-(n-\gamma q)_-}{q}+\frac{m-\left(n-\delta p'\right)_-}{p'}}\ t^{\beta-n+\frac{(n-\gamma q)_+}{q}+\frac{\left(n-\delta p'\right)_+}{p'}} \\
= &\ s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}-\left(\frac{n}{q}-\gamma\right)_-+\frac{m}{p'}-\left(\frac{n}{p'}-\delta\right)_-}\ t^{\beta-n+\left(\frac{n}{q}-\gamma\right)_+-\left(\frac{n}{p'}-\delta\right)_+}\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly if $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m}\ t^{\beta-n}\ \mathcal{I}_{s,t}^{m,n}(-\gamma q)^{\frac{1}{q}}\ \mathcal{I}_{s,t}^{m,n}(-\delta p')^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
= &\ s^{\alpha-m}\ t^{\beta-n}\ \left(s^{(m-\gamma q)_+}\ t^{n-(m-\gamma q)_-}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\ \left(s^{\left(m-\delta p'\right)_+}\ t^{n-\left(m-\delta p'\right)_-}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
= &\ s^{\alpha-m+\frac{(m-\gamma q)_+}{q}+\frac{\left(m-\delta p'\right)_+}{p'}}\ t^{\beta-n+\frac{n-(m-\gamma q)_-}{q}+\frac{n-\left(m-\delta p'\right)_-}{p'}n} \\
= &\ s^{\alpha-m+\left(\frac{m}{q}-\gamma\right)_+-\left(\frac{m}{p'}-\delta\right)_+}\ t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}-\left(\frac{m}{q}-\gamma\right)_-+\frac{n}{p'}-\left(\frac{m}{p'}-\delta\right)_-}\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

with the understanding that

$$\begin{aligned}
s^{0_+}\ t^{-0_-} &= \ln\frac{s}{t} \text{ when } 0 < t \leq s < \infty, \\
s^{-0_-}\ t^{0_+} &= \ln\frac{t}{s} \text{ when } 0 < s \leq t < \infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

In order to efficiently calculate the remaining conditions, we assume for the moment that $m \leq n$, and remove this restriction at the end.

Now we consider separately the (at most) five cases determined by δ (since the open interval $\left(\frac{m}{q}, \frac{n}{q}\right)$ is empty if $m = n$):

$$\delta \in \left(-\infty, \frac{m}{p'}\right), \quad \delta = \frac{m}{p'}, \quad \delta \in \left(\frac{m}{p'}, \frac{n}{p'}\right), \quad \delta = \frac{n}{p'}, \quad \delta \in \left(\frac{n}{p'}, \infty\right).$$

Case A: $\delta < \frac{m}{p'}$. Then for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}-\left(\frac{n}{q}-\gamma\right)_-+\frac{m}{p'}}\ t^{\beta-n+\left(\frac{n}{q}-\gamma\right)_+-\frac{n}{p'}-\delta}\ ,$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\left(\frac{m}{q}-\gamma\right)_+-\frac{m}{p'}-\delta}\ t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}-\left(\frac{m}{q}-\gamma\right)_-+\frac{n}{p'}}\ .$$

Now we consider separately within Case A the (at most) five subcases determined by γ (since the open interval $\left(\frac{m}{q}, \frac{n}{q}\right)$ is empty if $m = n$):

$$\gamma \in \left(-\infty, \frac{m}{q}\right), \quad \gamma = \frac{m}{q}, \quad \gamma \in \left(\frac{m}{q}, \frac{n}{q}\right), \quad \gamma = \frac{n}{q}, \quad \gamma \in \left(\frac{n}{q}, \infty\right).$$

Subcase A1: $\gamma \in \left(-\infty, \frac{m}{q}\right)$. In this subcase $\frac{m}{q} - \gamma > 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma > 0$, and so for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}+\frac{m}{p'}}\ t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}-\gamma+\frac{n}{p'}-\delta}\ ,$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}-\gamma+\frac{m}{p'}-\delta}\ t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}+\frac{n}{p'}}\ .$$

Thus in the presence of the power weight equality (8.5), the boundedness of these two local characteristics $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ in the indicated ranges is equivalent to the four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'} &\geq 0,\\
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} - \gamma + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{n}{p'} &\geq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m},\\
\Gamma &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this case.

Subcase A2: $\gamma = \frac{m}{q}$ and $m < n$. In this subcase $\frac{m}{q} - \gamma = 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma > 0$, and so for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}+\frac{m}{p'}}\, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}-\gamma+\frac{n}{p'}-\delta},$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have from (8.7) that

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{p'}-\delta}\, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}+\frac{n}{p'}} \ln\frac{s}{t}.$$

Thus the boundedness of these two local characteristics $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ in the indicated ranges is equivalent to the four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'} &\geq 0,\\
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta &< 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{n}{p'} &> 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} < \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m},\\
\Gamma &< \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this subcase.

Subcase A3: $\gamma \in \left(\frac{m}{q}, \frac{n}{q}\right)$. In this subcase $\frac{m}{q} - \gamma < 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma > 0$, and so for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}+\frac{m}{p'}}\, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}-\gamma+\frac{n}{p'}-\delta},$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{p'}-\delta}\, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}+\frac{m}{q}-\gamma+\frac{n}{p'}}.$$

Thus the boundedness of these two local characteristics $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ in the indicated ranges is equivalent to the four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'} &\geq 0,\\
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{m}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'} &\geq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} - \frac{\gamma - \frac{m}{q}}{m},\\
\Gamma + \frac{\gamma - \frac{m}{q}}{n} &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this subcase.

Subcase A4: $\gamma = \frac{n}{q}$ and $m < n$. In this subcase $\frac{m}{q} - \gamma < 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma = 0$, and so for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have from (8.7) that

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'}}\, t^{\beta - n + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta} \ln \frac{t}{s}\ ,$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha - m + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta}\, t^{\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{m}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'}}\ .$$

Thus the boundedness of these two local characteristics $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ in the indicated ranges is equivalent to the four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'} &> 0,\\
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{m}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'} &\geq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta &< 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma &< \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\frac{m}{q}+\delta}{m},\\
\Gamma + \frac{\gamma - \frac{m}{q}}{n} &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} < \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this subcase.

Subcase A5: $\gamma \in \left(\frac{n}{q}, \infty\right)$. In this subcase $\frac{m}{q} - \gamma < 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma < 0$, and so for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{n}{q} - \gamma + \frac{m}{p'}}\, t^{\beta - n + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta}\ ,$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha - m + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta}\, t^{\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{m}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'}}\ .$$

Thus the boundedness of these two local characteristics $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ in the indicated ranges is equivalent to the four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{n}{q} - \gamma + \frac{m}{p'} &\geq 0,\\
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{m}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'} &\geq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma + \frac{\gamma - \frac{n}{q}}{m} &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} - \frac{\gamma - \frac{m}{q}}{m},\\
\Gamma + \frac{\gamma - \frac{m}{q}}{n} &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} - \frac{\gamma - \frac{n}{q}}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this subcase.

Subcase A6: $\gamma = \frac{n}{q}$ and $m = n$. In this case $\frac{m}{q} - \gamma = 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma = 0$, and so for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have from (8.7) that

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'}}\, t^{\beta - n + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta} \ln \frac{t}{s}\ ,$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha - m + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta}\, t^{\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{n}{p'}} \ln \frac{s}{t}\ .$$

Thus the boundedness of these two local characteristics $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ in the indicated ranges is equivalent to the four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'} &> 0,\\
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta &< 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{n}{p'} &> 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta &< 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma &< \frac{\alpha}{m} < \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m},\\
\Gamma &< \frac{\beta}{n} < \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this case.

Now we turn to the next major case.

Case B: $\delta = \frac{m}{p'}$. Then for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} - \left(\frac{n}{q} - \gamma\right)_- + \frac{m}{p'}}\, t^{\beta - n + \left(\frac{n}{q} - \gamma\right)_+ + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta}\ ,$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have from (8.7) that

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha - m + \left(\frac{m}{q} - \gamma\right)_+ + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta}\, t^{\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} - \left(\frac{m}{q} - \gamma\right)_- + \frac{n}{p'}} \ln \frac{s}{t}\ .$$

Now we consider separately within Case B the (at most) five subcases determined by γ (since the open interval $\left(\frac{m}{q}, \frac{n}{q}\right)$ is empty if $m = n$):

$$\gamma \in \left(-\infty, \frac{m}{q}\right), \quad \gamma = \frac{m}{q}, \quad \gamma \in \left(\frac{m}{q}, \frac{n}{q}\right), \quad \gamma = \frac{n}{q}, \quad \gamma \in \left(\frac{n}{q}, \infty\right).$$

Subcase B1: $\gamma \in \left(-\infty, \frac{m}{q}\right)$. In this subcase $\frac{m}{q} - \gamma > 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma > 0$, and so for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}+\frac{m}{p'}} \, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}-\gamma+\frac{n}{p'}-\delta} \, ,$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}-\gamma+\frac{m}{p'}-\delta} \, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}+\frac{n}{p'}} \ln \frac{s}{t} \, .$$

Thus in the presence of the power weight equality (8.5), the boundedness of these two local characteristics $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ in the indicated ranges is equivalent to the four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{m}{p'} &\geq 0, \\ \alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} - \gamma + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta &< 0, \\ \beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{n}{p'} &> 0, \\ \beta - n + \frac{n}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} < \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m}, \\ \Gamma &< \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this subcase.

Case B2: $\gamma = \frac{m}{q}$. In this case $\frac{m}{q} - \gamma = 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma > 0$, and so for $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}+\frac{m}{p'}} \, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}-\gamma+\frac{n}{p'}-\delta} \, ,$$

and for $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{p'}-\delta} \, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}+\frac{n}{p'}} \ln \frac{s}{t} \, .$$

This coincides with Subcase A2 above and so is equivalent to the four conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} < \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m}, \\ \Gamma &< \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this subcase.

The remaining subcases **B3**, **B4**, **B5** and **B6** are handled in similar fashion.

Case C: $\frac{m}{p'} < \delta < \frac{n}{p'}$. This is handled in similar fashion.

Case D: $\delta = \frac{n}{p'}$. This is handled in similar fashion.

Case E: $\frac{n}{p'} < \delta < \infty$. The subcases **E1**, **E2**, **E3**, **E4** and **E6**, are handled in similar fashion, and we end with the remaining and final subcase.

Subcase E5: $\frac{n}{q} < \gamma < \infty$. In this case we have both $\frac{n}{p'} - \delta < 0$ and $\frac{n}{q} - \gamma < 0$ and so if $0 < s \leq t < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m+\frac{m}{q}+\frac{n}{q}-\gamma+\frac{m}{p'}+\frac{n}{p'}-\delta} \, t^{\beta-n} \, ,$$

and similarly if $0 < t \leq s < \infty$, we have

$$A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)[I,J] = s^{\alpha-m} \, t^{\beta-n+\frac{n}{q}+\frac{m}{q}-\gamma+\frac{n}{p'}+\frac{m}{p'}-\delta} \, .$$

Thus in the presence of the power weight equality (8.5), the boundedness of these two local characteristics $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)$ in the indicated ranges is equivalent to the four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha - m + \frac{m}{q} + \frac{n}{q} - \gamma + \frac{m}{p'} + \frac{n}{p'} - \delta &\geq 0,\\
\alpha - m &\leq 0,\\
\beta - n + \frac{n}{q} + \frac{m}{q} - \gamma + \frac{n}{p'} + \frac{m}{p'} - \delta &\geq 0,\\
\beta - n &\leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma - \frac{n}{m}\left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'}\right) + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq 1,\\
\Gamma - \frac{m}{n}\left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'}\right) + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

which are the second and third lines in (4.13) in this subcase. Indeed, in this subcase, the second and third lines in (4.13) are

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma + \frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n)}{m} &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} - \frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m)}{m},\\
\Gamma + \frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m)}{n} &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} - \frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n)}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m) &\equiv \left(\gamma - \frac{m}{q}\right)_+ + \left(\delta - \frac{m}{p'}\right)_+,\\
\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n) &\equiv \left(\gamma - \frac{n}{q}\right)_+ + \left(\delta - \frac{n}{p'}\right)_+.
\end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma + \frac{\gamma - \frac{n}{q} + \delta - \frac{n}{p'}}{m} &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} - \frac{\gamma - \frac{m}{q} + \delta - \frac{m}{p'}}{m},\\
\Gamma + \frac{\gamma - \frac{m}{q} + \delta - \frac{m}{p'}}{n} &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} - \frac{\gamma - \frac{n}{q} + \delta - \frac{n}{p'}}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma - \frac{n}{m}\left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'}\right) + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m} &\leq \frac{\alpha}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1,\\
\Gamma - \frac{m}{n}\left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'}\right) + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} &\leq \frac{\beta}{n} \leq \Gamma + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we note that these families of inequalities for α, β remain the same when $m \geq n$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 8.

8.2. **Strict inequalities.** The strict inequalities in the next corollary will prove useful below in deriving the power weight norm inequality (4.14) in Theorem 9. Indeed, these strict inequalities arise in verifying the strict constraint inequalities (2.5) in the 1-parameter setting, in order that Theorem 3 can be applied iteratively in conjunction with the sandwiching technique - the cases $\alpha = m$ and $\beta = n$ are somewhat different.

Corollary 3. *If $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta, w_\gamma) < \infty$, then the following inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &\leq m \text{ and } \beta \leq n,\\
\frac{\alpha}{m} &\leq \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{m} + \frac{1}{q'},\ \frac{\delta}{m} + \frac{1}{p}\right\},\\
\frac{\beta}{n} &\leq \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{q'},\ \frac{\delta}{n} + \frac{1}{p}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have the corresponding strict *inequalities in the following cases:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\alpha}{m} &< 1 \text{ when either } \frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\leq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\leq 0,\\
\frac{\beta}{n} &< 1 \text{ when either } \frac{\gamma}{n}-\frac{1}{q}\leq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\delta}{n}-\frac{1}{p'}\leq 0,\\
\frac{\alpha}{m} &< \frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{q'} \text{ when either } \frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\geq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\leq 0,\\
\frac{\alpha}{m} &< \frac{\delta}{m}+\frac{1}{p} \text{ when either } \frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\leq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\geq 0,\\
\frac{\beta}{n} &< \frac{\gamma}{n}+\frac{1}{q'} \text{ when either } \frac{\gamma}{n}-\frac{1}{q}\geq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\delta}{n}-\frac{1}{p'}\leq 0,\\
\frac{\beta}{n} &< \frac{\delta}{n}+\frac{1}{p} \text{ when either } \frac{\gamma}{n}-\frac{1}{q}\leq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\delta}{n}-\frac{1}{p'}\geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.8}
$$

In particular, these strict inequalities for $\frac{\alpha}{m}$ *and* $\frac{\beta}{n}$ *all hold if both* $\gamma\leq\frac{\min\{m,n\}}{q}$ *and* $\delta\leq\frac{\min\{m,n\}}{p'}$ *hold (c.f. (4.12) which shows that* $\gamma<\frac{m+n}{q}$ *and* $\delta<\frac{m+n}{p'}$ *are required by finiteness of* $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta,w_\gamma)$*).*

Proof. We compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\alpha}{m} &\leq \Gamma+\frac{\gamma+\delta}{m}-\frac{\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m)}{m}\\
&= \frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\gamma+\delta}{m}-\left\{\left(\frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\right)_+ +\left(\frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)_+\right\}\\
&= 1-\left\{\left(\frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\right)_- +\left(\frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)_-\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

and similarly

$$
\frac{\beta}{n}\leq 1-\left\{\left(\frac{\gamma}{n}-\frac{1}{q}\right)_- +\left(\frac{\delta}{n}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)_-\right\}.
$$

Using $-x_-=\min\{0,x\}$ we also compute that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\alpha}{m} &\leq 1-\left\{\left(\frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\right)_- +\left(\frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)_-\right\}\\
&\leq \min\left\{1-\left(\frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\right)_-, 1-\left(\frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)_-\right\}\\
&\leq \min\left\{1+\frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}, 1+\frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\right\}\\
&= \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{q'}, \frac{\delta}{m}+\frac{1}{p}\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

and moreover that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\alpha}{m} &< \frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{q'} \text{ when either } \frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\leq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\geq 0,\\
\frac{\alpha}{m} &< \frac{\delta}{m}+\frac{1}{p} \text{ when either } \frac{\gamma}{m}-\frac{1}{q}\leq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\geq 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly we have

$$
\frac{\beta}{n}\leq \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{n}+\frac{1}{q'}, \frac{\delta}{n}+\frac{1}{p}\right\},
$$

and moreover that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\beta}{n} &< \frac{\gamma}{n}+\frac{1}{q'} \text{ when either } \frac{\delta}{n}-\frac{1}{p'}\leq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\gamma}{n}-\frac{1}{q}\geq 0,\\ \frac{\beta}{n} &< \frac{\delta}{n}+\frac{1}{p} \text{ when either } \frac{\gamma}{n}-\frac{1}{q}\leq 0 \text{ or } \frac{\delta}{n}-\frac{1}{p'}\geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

□

8.3. **Necessity of the two-tailed condition for power weights.** In addition to Theorem 8 and its corollary above, we will also use the following proposition which strengthens Lemma 3 above when one of the weights is a power weight.

Proposition 2. *Suppose at least one of the weights σ,ω is a power weight on $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$. Then for $1<p,q<\infty$ and $\alpha,\beta>0$, we have*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)\leq C\ \mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega),$$

where C is a positive constant depending on m,n,α,β,p,q and the power weight.

By duality we may suppose without loss of generality that σ is a locally integrable power weight. Indeed, modifying slightly the proof of Lemma 3, we have with

$$\mathcal{E}_{x,y}(I,J)\equiv\left\{(u,t)\in\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n:|x-u|\geq|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}\ \text{ and }\ |y-t|\geq|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}\right\},$$

that

$$|x-u|^{\alpha-m}\ |y-t|^{\beta-n}\geq\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{x,y}(I,J)}((u,t))\ |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)\,\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)\ ,$$

and so for $R>0$ and $f_R(u,t)\equiv\mathbf{1}_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}(u,t)\,\widehat{s}_Q(u,t)^{p'-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}(f_R\sigma)(x,y) &= \iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}|x-u|^{\alpha-n}|y-t|^{\beta-n}\widehat{s}_Q(u,t)^{p'-1}\,d\sigma(u,t)\\ &\geq \iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{x,y}(I,J)}((u,t))\ |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)\,\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)\,\widehat{s}_Q(u,t)^{p'-1}\,d\sigma(u,t)\\ &= |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)\iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{x,y}(I,J)}((u,t))\ \widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t).\end{aligned}$$

It is at this point that we use our assumption that $\sigma(u,t)=|(u,t)|^{\rho}$, $\rho>-(m+n)$, is a locally integrable power weight in order to conclude that

$$\iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{x,y}(I,J)}((u,t))\ \widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t)\geq c_{m,n,\alpha,\beta,p,q,\rho}\iint_{B(0,R)\times B(0,R)}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\sigma(u,t)$$

holds for $(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n$ with a constant $c_{m,n,\alpha,\beta,p,q,\rho}$ independent of $(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n$. Now we continue with the proof of Lemma 3 as given earlier to conclude that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)\leq\left(\frac{1}{c_{m,n,\alpha,\beta,p,q,\rho}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega).$$

8.4. **Proof of Theorem 9.** The necessity of (4.15) follows from the inequality

$$|x-u|^{\alpha-m}|y-t|^{\beta-n}\leq|(x-u,y-t)|^{\alpha+\beta-(m+n)},$$

which shows that the 1-parameter fractional integral $I_{\alpha+\beta}^{m+n}f$ is dominated by the 2-parameter fractional integral $I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}f$ when f is nonnegative. Thus Theorem 14 shows that $p\leq q$. Local integrability of the kernel is necessary for the norm inequality, and so $\alpha,\beta>0$. The necessity of finiteness of the two-tailed Muckenhoupt characteristic $\widehat{A}_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(v,w)$ now follows from Proposition 2.

For the sufficiency of (4.15) and the finiteness of the Muckenhoupt characteristic $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta,w_\gamma)$, we will use Young's inequality

$$a^{1-\theta}b^{\theta}\leq\sqrt{a^2+b^2}\leq a+b, \tag{8.9}$$

valid for $a, b \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, in order to define weight pairs to which the sandwiching principle can be applied. The special cases $\alpha = m$ and $\beta = n$, along with some additional exceptional cases, will be treated at the end of the proof.

8.4.1. *The nonexceptional cases.* We assume that $\alpha < m$ and $\beta < n$ and show here that $N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta, w_\gamma) < \infty$ follows from $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta, w_\gamma) < \infty$ when both $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\delta \geq 0$, and also when either $\gamma < 0$ or $\delta < 0$, except when one of the following four exceptional cases holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{m} &= \frac{\gamma}{m} + \frac{1}{q'}, \qquad \gamma < 0 \text{ and } \delta > \frac{m}{p'}, \\ \frac{\alpha}{m} &= \frac{\delta}{m} + \frac{1}{p}, \qquad \delta < 0 \text{ and } \gamma > \frac{m}{q}, \\ \frac{\beta}{n} &= \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{q'}, \qquad \delta < 0 \text{ and } \gamma > \frac{n}{q}, \\ \frac{\beta}{n} &= \frac{\delta}{n} + \frac{1}{p}, \qquad \gamma < 0 \text{ and } \delta > \frac{n}{p'}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.10}$$

First we suppose that $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\delta \geq 0$. Define the weight pair

$$(V(u,t), W(x,y)) \equiv \left(|u|^{\frac{\delta_1 m}{m+n}} |t|^{\frac{\delta_2 n}{m+n}}, \left(\frac{1}{|x|}\right)^{\frac{\gamma_1 m}{m+n}} \left(\frac{1}{|y|}\right)^{\frac{\gamma_2 n}{m+n}} \right)$$

where the indices δ_1, δ_2, γ_1, γ_2 satisfy

$$\frac{\delta_1 m}{m+n} + \frac{\delta_2 n}{m+n} = \delta \text{ and } \frac{\gamma_1 m}{m+n} + \frac{\gamma_2 n}{m+n} = \gamma, \tag{8.11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha - \left(\frac{\gamma_1 m}{m+n} + \frac{\delta_1 m}{m+n}\right)}{m} &= \Gamma = \frac{\beta - \left(\frac{\gamma_2 n}{m+n} + \frac{\delta_2 n}{m+n}\right)}{n}, \\ \text{i.e. } \frac{\gamma_1 m}{m+n} + \frac{\delta_1 m}{m+n} &= \alpha - m\Gamma \text{ and } \frac{\gamma_2 n}{m+n} + \frac{\delta_2 n}{m+n} = \beta - n\Gamma \end{aligned} \tag{8.12}$$

Solving for

$$\triangle_1 \equiv \frac{\delta_1 m}{m+n}, \quad \triangle_2 \equiv \frac{\delta_2 n}{m+n}, \quad \Gamma_1 \equiv \frac{\gamma_1 m}{m+n}\gamma_1, \quad \Gamma_2 \equiv \frac{\gamma_2 n}{m+n},$$

we obtain the system

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \triangle_1 \\ \triangle_2 \\ \Gamma_1 \\ \Gamma_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta \\ \beta - n\Gamma \\ \gamma \\ \alpha - m\Gamma \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8.13}$$

which in reduced row echelon form is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \triangle_1 \\ \triangle_2 \\ \Gamma_1 \\ \Gamma_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta - \beta + n\Gamma \\ \beta - n\Gamma \\ \gamma \\ \alpha - m\Gamma - \delta + \beta - n\Gamma \end{pmatrix}.$$

The system is solvable since $\alpha - m\Gamma - \delta + \beta - n\Gamma = 0$ by the power weight equality in the first line of (4.13), and the general solution to the system (8.13) is thus given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \triangle_1 \\ \triangle_2 \\ \Gamma_1 \\ \Gamma_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta - \beta + n\Gamma \\ \beta - n\Gamma \\ \gamma \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \equiv \mathbf{z}_\lambda, \qquad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Among these solution vectors $\mathbf{z}_\lambda$, we will find a vector satisfying all of the constraint inequalities needed below.

Now by Young's inequality (8.9) and (8.11), we have

$$\frac{w(x,y)}{v(u,t)} \leq \frac{W(x,y)}{V(u,t)},$$

and so by the sandwiching principle, Lemma 1, we have

$$N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) \leq N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(V,W). \tag{8.14}$$

Moreover, the weights V, W are product weights,

$$\begin{aligned} V(u,t) &= V_1(u) V_2(t) \text{ and } W(x,y) = W_1(x) W_2(y); \\ V_1(u) &= |u|^{\frac{\delta_1 m}{m+n}}, \quad V_2(t) = |t|^{\frac{\delta_2 n}{m+n}}, \\ W_1(x) &= \left(\frac{1}{|x|}\right)^{\frac{\gamma_1 m}{m+n}}, \quad W_2(y) = \left(\frac{1}{|y|}\right)^{\frac{\gamma_2 n}{m+n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the 1-parameter weight pairs $(V_1(u), W_1(x))$ and $(V_2(t), W_2(y))$ each satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3 on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$ respectively for an appropriate choice of solution vector above.

Indeed, to see this, note that the first weight pair $(V_1(u), W_1(x)) = \left(|u|^{\triangle_1}, |x|^{-\Gamma_1}\right)$ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ satisfies the equality

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha - (\Gamma_1 + \triangle_1)}{m} \tag{8.15}$$

by (8.12). We also claim the inequalities

$$q\Gamma_1 < m \text{ and } p'\triangle_1 < m \text{ and } \Gamma_1 + \triangle_1 \geq 0, \tag{8.16}$$

for an appropriate family of solution vectors $\mathbf{z}_\lambda$. The third inequality actually holds for all solution vectors $\mathbf{z}_\lambda$ since

$$\Gamma_1 + \triangle_1 = \gamma + \delta - \beta + n\Gamma \geq 0,$$

by (4.13). Thus the equality (8.15), and the inequalities (8.16), all hold for those solution vectors $\mathbf{z}_\lambda$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma_1 < \frac{m}{q} \text{ and } \triangle_1 < \frac{m}{p'}; \\ \text{i.e} \quad &\gamma + \lambda < \frac{m}{q} \text{ and } \delta - \beta + n\Gamma - \lambda < \frac{m}{p'}; \\ \text{i.e.} \quad &\delta - \beta + n\Gamma - \frac{m}{p'} < \lambda < \frac{m}{q} - \gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{8.17}$$

The second weight pair $(V_2(t), W_2(y)) = \left(|t|^{\triangle_2}, |y|^{-\Gamma_2}\right)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the equality

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha - (\Gamma_2 + \triangle_2)}{n} \tag{8.18}$$

by (8.12). We also claim the inequalities

$$q\Gamma_2 < n \text{ and } p'\triangle_2 < n \text{ and } \Gamma_2 + \triangle_2 \geq 0, \tag{8.19}$$

for an appropriate family of solution vectors $\mathbf{z}_\lambda$. The third inequality actually holds for all solution vectors $\mathbf{z}_\lambda$ since

$$\Gamma_2 + \triangle_2 = \alpha + \beta - (m+n)\Gamma = \gamma + \delta \geq 0,$$

by (4.13). Thus the equality (8.18), and the inequalities (8.19), all hold for those solution vectors $\mathbf{z}_\lambda$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma_2 < \frac{n}{q} \text{ and } \triangle_2 < \frac{n}{p'}; \\ \text{i.e.} \quad &-\lambda < \frac{n}{q} \text{ and } \beta - n\Gamma + \lambda < \frac{n}{p'}; \\ \text{i.e.} \quad &-\frac{n}{q} < \lambda < \frac{n}{p'} - \beta + n\Gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{8.20}$$

In order to find λ satisfying (8.17) and (8.20) simultaneously, we must establish the four strict inequalities in

$$\max\left\{\delta-\beta+n\Gamma-\frac{m}{p'},-\frac{n}{q}\right\}<\min\left\{\frac{m}{q}-\gamma,\frac{n}{p'}-\beta+n\Gamma\right\}.$$

Now two of these four strict inequalities follow from the local integrability of the weights $|(x,y)|^{-\gamma q}$ and $|(u,t)|^{-\gamma p'}$ on $\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n$, namely

$$\begin{aligned}\delta-\beta+n\Gamma-\frac{m}{p'} &< \frac{n}{p'}-\beta+n\Gamma \text{ and } -\frac{n}{q}<\frac{m}{q}-\gamma;\\ \text{i.e. } \delta &< \frac{m+n}{p'} \text{ and } \gamma<\frac{m+n}{q}.\end{aligned}$$

The other two strict inequalities follow from the assumptions that $\alpha<m$ and $\beta<n$, namely

$$\begin{aligned}&\delta-\beta+n\Gamma-\frac{m}{p'}<\frac{m}{q}-\gamma \text{ and } -\frac{n}{q}<\frac{n}{p'}-\beta+n\Gamma;\\ \text{i.e.}\quad &\delta+\gamma<\beta-n\Gamma+m\left(\frac{1}{p'}+\frac{1}{q}\right) \text{ and } \beta<n\left(\frac{1}{p'}+\frac{1}{q}\right)+n\Gamma;\\ \text{i.e.}\quad &\delta+\gamma<\beta-n\Gamma+m\left(1-\Gamma\right) \text{ and } \beta<n\left(1-\Gamma\right)+n\Gamma;\\ \text{i.e.}\quad &(m+n)\,\Gamma+(\delta+\gamma)<m+\beta \text{ and } \beta<n;\\ \text{i.e.}\quad &\alpha+\beta<m+\beta \text{ and } \beta<n,\end{aligned}$$

where in the final line above we have used the power weight equality from the first line of (4.13).

Thus there does indeed exist a choice of $\gamma\in\mathbb{R}$ so that the equalities (8.15), (8.18) and inequalities (8.16), (8.19) all hold. It now follows from Theorem 12 that

$$\begin{aligned}N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(V,W) &\leq N_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(V_1,W_1)\ N_{p,q}^{\beta,n}(V_2,W_2)\\ &\leq CA_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(V_1,W_1)\ A_{p,q}^{\beta,n}(V_2,W_2)<\infty,\end{aligned}$$

and combined with (8.14) this yields

$$N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)<\infty,$$

in the case $\gamma\geq 0$ and $\delta\geq 0$.

For the next two cases, where one of γ and δ is negative, we will assume that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\alpha}{m} &< \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{q'},\ \frac{\delta}{m}+\frac{1}{p}\right\},\\ \frac{\beta}{n} &< \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{n}+\frac{1}{q'},\ \frac{\delta}{n}+\frac{1}{p}\right\},\end{aligned}\tag{8.21}$$

in order to apply the sandwiching technique. We will treat the exceptional cases in (8.10) later.

Next we suppose that $\gamma<0<\delta$. In this case we will incounter two exceptional cases that are treated later. Let $\rho\equiv\gamma+\delta\geq 0$ and $\eta\equiv-\gamma>0$. Then by Young's inequality (8.9), the weight pairs

$$\begin{aligned}\left(V(u,t),W(x,y)\right) &\equiv \left(|u|^{\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}+\eta_1}|t|^{\frac{\rho_1 n}{m+n}},|x|^{\eta}\right),\\ \left(V'(u,t),W'(x,y)\right) &\equiv \left(|u|^{\frac{\rho_2 m}{m+n}}|t|^{\frac{\rho_2 n}{m+n}+\eta_2},|y|^{\eta}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_j+\eta_j=\rho+\eta=\delta>0$ for $j=1,2$, satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{w(x,y)}{v(u,t)} &= \frac{\left(|x|^2+|y|^2\right)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{\left(|u|^2+|t|^2\right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}=\frac{\left(|x|^2+|y|^2\right)^{\frac{\eta}{2}}}{\left(|u|^2+|t|^2\right)^{\frac{\rho+\eta}{2}}}\\ &\lesssim \frac{|x|^{\eta}+|y|^{\eta}}{\left(|u|^2+|t|^2\right)^{\frac{\rho_1}{2}}\left(|u|^2+|t|^2\right)^{\frac{\eta_1}{2}}}+\frac{|x|^{\eta}+|y|^{\eta}}{\left(|u|^2+|t|^2\right)^{\frac{\rho_2}{2}}\left(|u|^2+|t|^2\right)^{\frac{\eta_2}{2}}}\\ &\lesssim \frac{|x|^{\eta}}{\left(|u|^{\frac{m}{m+n}}|t|^{\frac{n}{m+n}}\right)^{\rho_1}|u|^{\eta_1}}+\frac{|y|^{\eta}}{\left(|u|^{\frac{m}{m+n}}|t|^{\frac{n}{m+n}}\right)^{\rho_2}|t|^{\eta_2}}=\frac{W(x,y)}{V(u,t)}+\frac{W'(x,y)}{V'(u,t)},\end{aligned}$$

and so by the sandwiching principle, Lemma 1, we have

$$N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) \leq N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(V,W) + N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(V',W').$$

Moreover, the weights V, V', W, W' are product weights,

$$\begin{aligned} V(u,t) &= V_1(u) V_2(t) \text{ and } V'(u,t) = V_1'(u) V_2'(t), \\ W(x,y) &= W_1(x) W_2(y) \text{ and } W'(x,y) = W_1'(x) W_2'(y), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} V_1(u) = |u|^{\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}+\eta_1} & V_2(t) = |t|^{\frac{\rho_1 n}{m+n}} & V_1'(u) = |u|^{\frac{\rho_2 m}{m+n}} & V_2'(t) = |t|^{\frac{\rho_2 n}{m+n}+\eta_2} \\ W_1(x) = |x|^{\eta} & W_2(y) = 1 & W_1'(x) = 1 & W_2'(y) = |y|^{\eta} \end{cases},$$

and where the 1-parameter weight pairs $(V_1(u), W_1(x)), (V_1'(u), W_1'(x))$ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $(V_2(t), W_2(y)), (V_2'(t), W_2'(y))$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ each satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3 provided we choose ρ_1 and η_1 to satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha - \left(-\eta + \frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n} + \eta_1\right)}{m} &= \Gamma = \frac{\alpha+\beta-\rho}{m+n}, \\ \text{and } \frac{\beta - \left(-0 + \frac{\rho_1 n}{m+n}\right)}{n} &= \Gamma = \frac{\alpha+\beta-\rho}{m+n}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.22}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{m} - \frac{\rho_1}{m+n} + \frac{\eta-\eta_1}{m} &= \frac{\alpha+\beta-\rho}{m+n} = \frac{\beta}{n} - \frac{\rho_1}{m+n}; \\ \frac{\alpha}{m} + \frac{\eta-\eta_1}{m} &= \frac{\alpha+\beta+\rho_1-\rho}{m+n} = \frac{\beta}{n}; \\ \frac{\beta}{n} - \frac{\alpha}{m} &= \frac{\eta-\eta_1}{m} \text{ and } \frac{\alpha+\beta}{m+n} = \frac{\beta}{n} + \frac{\rho-\rho_1}{m+n}; \\ \frac{\eta-\eta_1}{m} &= \frac{\beta}{n} - \frac{\alpha}{m} \text{ and } \frac{\rho-\rho_1}{m+n} = \frac{\alpha+\beta}{m+n} - \frac{\beta}{n}; \\ \frac{\eta_1}{m} &= \frac{\alpha+\eta}{m} - \frac{\beta}{n} \text{ and } \frac{\rho_1}{m+n} = \frac{\rho-(\alpha+\beta)}{m+n} + \frac{\beta}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\eta_1 = \alpha + \eta - \frac{m}{n}\beta \text{ and } \rho_1 = \rho - (\alpha+\beta) + \frac{m+n}{n}\beta, \tag{8.23}$$

and where ρ_2 and η_2 will be chosen below. Once we have established the appropriate hypotheses of Theorem 3, Theorem 12 will show that

$$N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) < \infty,$$

in the case $\gamma < 0 < \delta$.

To show that these four weight pairs satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3, we first note that

$$\rho_1 = (m+n)\left[\frac{(\gamma+\delta)-(\alpha+\beta)}{m+n} + \frac{\beta}{n}\right] = (m+n)\left(\frac{\beta}{n} - \Gamma\right) \geq 0 \tag{8.24}$$

by the power weight equality in (4.13), and the third line in (4.13), and also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 + \eta_1 &= (m+n)\left\{\frac{\rho-(\alpha+\beta)}{m+n} + \frac{\beta}{n}\right\} + m\left\{\frac{\alpha+\eta}{m} - \frac{\beta}{n}\right\} \\ &= \rho - (\alpha+\beta) + \frac{m+n}{n}\beta + (\alpha+\eta) - \frac{m}{n}\beta = \rho + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we verify that the first weight pair $(V_1(u), W_1(x)) = \left(|u|^{\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}+\eta_1}, |x|^{\eta}\right)$ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ satisfies the 1-parameter power weight equality

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha - \left(-\eta + \frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n} + \eta_1\right)}{m}, \tag{8.25}$$

as well as the 1-parameter constraint inequalities

$$q(-\eta) < m \text{ and } p'\left(\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}+\eta_1\right) < m \text{ and } -\eta+\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}+\eta_1 \geq 0. \tag{8.26}$$

The equality (8.25) follows immediately from (8.23), the first line in (4.13), and (8.22). The first inequality in (8.26) is trivial, and the third inequality in (8.26) is

$$-\eta+\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}+\eta_1 \geq 0,$$

which follows from (8.23):

$$\begin{aligned} -\eta+\frac{m}{m+n}\rho_1+\eta_1 &= -\eta+\frac{m}{m+n}\left[\rho-(\alpha+\beta)+\frac{m+n}{n}\beta\right]+\alpha+\eta-\frac{m}{n}\beta \\ &= -\eta+\frac{m}{m+n}(\rho-(\alpha+\beta))+\frac{m}{n}\beta+\alpha+\eta-\frac{m}{n}\beta \\ &= \frac{m}{m+n}(\rho-(\alpha+\beta))+\alpha \\ &= m\left(\frac{\rho-(\alpha+\beta)}{m+n}+\frac{\alpha}{m}\right)=m\left(\frac{\alpha}{m}-\Gamma\right)\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{8.27}$$

The second inequality in (8.26) is

$$\frac{1}{m}\left(\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}+\eta_1\right) < \frac{1}{p'}, \tag{8.28}$$

which, using $\gamma=-\eta$ with the equality $-\eta+\frac{m}{m+n}\rho_1+\eta_1 = m\left(\frac{\alpha}{m}-\Gamma\right)=\alpha-m\Gamma$ just proved above in (8.27), is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{m}(\alpha-m\Gamma+\eta)<\frac{1}{p'}; \\ \text{i.e.}\quad &\frac{\alpha+\eta}{m}-\Gamma<\frac{1}{p'}; \\ \text{i.e.}\quad &\frac{\alpha}{m}<\Gamma+\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{p'}. \end{aligned}$$

However, from the second line in (4.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{m} &\leq \Gamma+\frac{\gamma+\delta}{m}-\frac{\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right)_+}{m} \\ &= \Gamma+\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{p'}+\frac{\delta-\frac{m}{p'}}{m}-\left(\frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)_+ \\ &= \Gamma+\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{p'}-\left(\frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)_- \\ &\leq \Gamma+\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{p'}, \end{aligned}$$

and in fact we have *strict* inequality

$$\frac{\alpha}{m}<\Gamma+\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{p'},$$

for $0<\delta\leq\frac{m}{p'}$. The remaining case is

$$\delta>\frac{m}{p'} \text{ and } \alpha-m\Gamma-\gamma=\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}+\eta_1=\frac{m}{p'},$$

which is an exceptional case in (8.10).

Next we note that the weight pair $(V_2(t), W_2(y)) = \left(|t|^{\frac{\rho_1 n}{m+n}}, 1\right)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the 1-parameter power weight equality

$$\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}=\frac{\beta-\left(-0+\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n}\right)}{n},$$

and the 1-parameter constraint inequalities,

$$q\left(-0\right) < n \text{ and } p'\left(\frac{\rho_1 n}{m+n}\right) < n \text{ and } -0+\frac{\rho_1 m}{m+n} \geq 0.$$

Indeed, for the equality we use (8.23), the first line in (4.13), and (8.22). The first of the constraint inequalities is trivial and the third constraint inequality follows from (8.24). The second of the constraint inequalities, namely $p'\left(\frac{\rho_1 n}{m+n}\right) < n$, is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{n}{m+n}\right)(m+n)\left(\frac{\beta}{n}-\Gamma\right) < \frac{n}{p'}; \\ \text{i.e.} \qquad & \frac{\beta}{n} < \Gamma + \frac{1}{p'}. \end{aligned}$$

However from the third line in (4.13) and the assumption that $\gamma < 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta}{n} &\leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} - \frac{\left(\delta - \frac{n}{p'}\right)_+}{n} \\ &= \Gamma + \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{p'} + \frac{\delta - \frac{n}{p'}}{n} - \left(\frac{\delta}{n} - \frac{1}{p'}\right)_+ \\ &= \Gamma + \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{p'} - \left(\frac{\delta}{n} - \frac{1}{p'}\right)_- \\ &\leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{p'} < \Gamma + \frac{1}{p'}, \end{aligned}$$

and this time there is no exceptional endpoint case. As indicated above, this completes the proof in the case $\gamma < 0 < \delta$.

The same arguments apply to the weight pair (V', W'), which we now sketch briefly. The weight pairs $\left(V_2'\left(t\right), W_2'\left(y\right)\right) = \left(|t|^{\frac{\rho_2 n}{m+n}+\eta_2}, |y|^{\eta}\right)$ and $\left(V_1'\left(u\right), W_1'\left(x\right)\right) = \left(|u|^{\frac{\rho_2 m}{m+n}}, 1\right)$ each satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3 provided we choose ρ_2 and η_2 to satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta - \left(-\eta + \frac{\rho_2 n}{m+n} + \eta_2\right)}{n} &= \Gamma = \frac{\alpha+\beta-\rho}{m+n}, \\ \text{and } \frac{\alpha - \left(-0 + \frac{\rho_2 m}{m+n}\right)}{m} &= \Gamma = \frac{\alpha+\beta-\rho}{m+n}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.29}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{m} - \frac{\rho_2}{m+n} &= \frac{\alpha+\beta-\rho}{m+n} = \frac{\beta}{n} - \frac{\rho_2}{m+n} + \frac{\eta-\eta_2}{n}; \\ \frac{\alpha}{m} &= \frac{\alpha+\beta+\rho_2-\rho}{m+n} = \frac{\beta}{n} + \frac{\eta-\eta_2}{n}; \\ \frac{\alpha}{m} - \frac{\beta}{n} &= \frac{\eta-\eta_2}{n} \text{ and } \frac{\alpha+\beta}{m+n} = \frac{\alpha}{m} + \frac{\rho-\rho_2}{m+n}; \\ \frac{\eta_2}{n} &= \frac{\beta+\eta}{n} - \frac{\alpha}{m} \text{ and } \frac{\rho_2}{m+n} = \frac{\rho-(\alpha+\beta)}{m+n} + \frac{\alpha}{m}; \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\eta_2 = \beta + \eta - \frac{n}{m}\alpha \text{ and } \rho_2 = \rho - (\alpha+\beta) + \frac{m+n}{m}\alpha. \tag{8.30}$$

All of the constraint inequalities hold by arguments similar to those above, except of course in the analogous exceptional endpoint case, and by way of example we treat just the second of the constraint inequalities for the weight pair that gives rise to the exceptional endpoint case. The second constraint inequality for the weight pair $\left(V_2'\left(t\right), W_2'\left(y\right)\right) = \left(|t|^{\frac{\rho_2 m}{m+n}+\eta_2}, |y|^{\eta}\right)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is

$$\frac{1}{n}\left(\frac{\rho_2 m}{m+n} + \eta_2\right) < \frac{1}{p'}. \tag{8.31}$$

Using $\gamma = -\eta$ with the equality

$$\begin{aligned} & -\eta + \frac{n}{m+n}\rho_2 + \eta_2 \\ = \; & -\eta + \frac{n}{m+n}\left[\rho - (\alpha+\beta) + \frac{m+n}{m}\alpha\right] + \beta + \eta - \frac{n}{m}\alpha \\ = \; & -\eta + \frac{n}{m+n}\left(\rho - (\alpha+\beta)\right) + \frac{n}{m}\alpha + \beta + \eta - \frac{n}{m}\alpha \\ = \; & \frac{n}{m+n}\left(\rho - (\alpha+\beta)\right) + \beta \\ = \; & n\left(\frac{\rho - (\alpha+\beta)}{m+n} + \frac{\beta}{n}\right) = n\left(\frac{\beta}{n} - \Gamma\right), \end{aligned}$$

we see that (8.31) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n}\left(n\left(\frac{\beta}{n} - \Gamma\right) + \eta\right) < \frac{1}{p'}; \\ \text{i.e.} \qquad & \frac{\beta}{n} < \Gamma + \frac{1}{p'} + \frac{\gamma}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

But the third line in (4.13) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta}{n} \; & \leq \; \Gamma + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{n} - \frac{\left(\delta - \frac{n}{p'}\right)_+}{n} \\ & = \; \Gamma + \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{p'} + \frac{\delta - \frac{n}{p'}}{n} - \left(\frac{\delta}{n} - \frac{1}{p'}\right)_+ \\ & = \; \Gamma + \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{p'} - \left(\frac{\delta}{n} - \frac{1}{p'}\right)_- \\ & \qquad \begin{cases} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{p'} & \text{if} \quad 0 < \delta \\ < \Gamma + \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{p'} & \text{if} \quad 0 < \delta \leq \frac{n}{p'} \end{cases}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives us (8.31)in the case $0 < \delta \leq \frac{n}{p'}$. The exceptional endpoint case thus occurs here when

$$\frac{n}{p'} < \delta \text{ and } \frac{\beta}{n} = \Gamma + \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{p'},$$

and this is another exceptional case in (8.10).

The case $\delta < 0 < \gamma$ is handled as above provided we avoid the exceptional cases in (8.10).

8.4.2. *The exceptional cases $\alpha = m$ or $\beta = n$.* Here we consider the two cases where $\alpha = m$ or $\beta = n$. We first show that the power weight norm inequality (4.14) holds when $\alpha = m$ and $p \leq q$ and $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta, w_\gamma) < \infty$. To see this, we note that from the first line in (8.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \; & < \; \beta < n, \\ \frac{m}{q} \; & < \; \gamma < \frac{m+n}{q}, \\ \frac{m}{p'} \; & < \; \delta < \frac{m+n}{p'}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we compute that

$$I_{m,\beta}^{m,n} f(x,y) = \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} |y-t|^{\beta-n} f(u,t)\, du dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y-t|^{\beta-n} F(t)\, dt = I_\beta^n F(y),$$

where $F(t) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(u,t)\,du$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\int_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} \left|I^{m,n}_{m,\beta} f(x,y)\right|^q \ |(x,y)|^{-\gamma q}\,dxdy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|I^n_\beta F(y)\right|^q \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |(x,y)|^{-\gamma q}\,dx\right) dy \\
&\approx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|I^n_\beta F(y)\right|^q |y|^{m-\gamma q}\,dy,
\end{aligned}$$

since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |(x,y)|^{-\gamma q}\,dx \approx \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |(|x|+|y|)|^{-\gamma q}\,dx = |y|^{m-\gamma q}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \left|\left(\frac{|x|}{|y|}+1\right)\right|^{-\gamma q} d\left(\frac{x}{|y|}\right) \approx |y|^{m-\gamma q}$$

for $m-\gamma q<0$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |F(t)|^p\,|t|^{\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right)p}\,dt &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(u,t)\,du\right|^p |t|^{\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right)p}\,dt \\
&\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |f(u,t)|^p\,(|u|+|t|)^{\delta p}\,du\right\}\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} (|u|+|t|)^{-\delta p'}\,du\right\}^{p-1} |t|^{\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right)p}\,dt \\
&\approx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |f(u,t)|^p\,(|u|+|t|)^{\delta p}\,du\right\}\left\{|t|^{m-\delta p'}\right\}^{p-1} |t|^{\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right)p}\,dt \\
&= \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} |f(u,t)|^p\,(|u|+|t|)^{\delta p}\,dudt,
\end{aligned}$$

since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} (|u|+|t|)^{-\delta p'}\,du \approx |t|^{m-\delta p'}$$

for $m-\delta p'<0$. Thus we conclude that (4.14) holds provided we have the 1-parameter power weight norm inequality

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|I^n_\beta F(y)\right|^q |y|^{-\left(\gamma-\frac{m}{q}\right)q}\,dy\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |F(t)|^p\,|t|^{\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right)p}\,dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

But this inequality holds by Theorem 3 since the 1-parameter power weight equality holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta-\left(\gamma-\frac{m}{q}\right)-\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right) &= \beta-\gamma-\delta+m\left(\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}\right) \\
&= \alpha+\beta-\gamma-\delta+m\left(\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}-1\right) \\
&= (m+n)\,\Gamma-m\Gamma=n\Gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

and each of the following four constraint inequalities holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
&0<\beta<n, \\
&\left(\gamma-\frac{m}{q}\right)<\frac{n}{q}, \\
&\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right)<\frac{n}{p'}, \\
&\left(\gamma-\frac{m}{q}\right)+\left(\delta-\frac{m}{p'}\right)\ge 0.
\end{aligned}$$

A similar argument shows that (4.14) holds when $\beta=n$ and $p\le q$ and $A^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(v_\delta,w_\gamma)<\infty$.

8.4.3. *The remaining exceptional cases.* An additional argument, using both real interpolation and the Stein-Weiss interpolation with change of measure theorem, is needed to handle the remaining exceptional cases in (8.10). We first rewrite the last two lines of (4.13) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\in \mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m,n) \equiv \left[m\Gamma + \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n),\ m\Gamma + \gamma + \delta - \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m)\right], \\ \beta &\in \mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n,m) \equiv \left[n\Gamma + \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m),\ n\Gamma + \gamma + \delta - \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{8.32}$$

Suppose that $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta, w_\gamma) < \infty$. We claim that $N_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v_\delta, w_\gamma) < \infty$. Recall that we have already proved Theorem 9 except for the four exceptional cases in (8.10), which we repeat here for convenience:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{m} &= \frac{\gamma}{m} + \frac{1}{q'}, \qquad \gamma < 0 \text{ and } \delta > \frac{m}{p'}, \\ \frac{\alpha}{m} &= \frac{\delta}{m} + \frac{1}{p}, \qquad \delta < 0 \text{ and } \gamma > \frac{m}{q}, \\ \frac{\beta}{n} &= \frac{\gamma}{n} + \frac{1}{q'}, \qquad \delta < 0 \text{ and } \gamma > \frac{n}{q}, \\ \frac{\beta}{n} &= \frac{\delta}{n} + \frac{1}{p}, \qquad \gamma < 0 \text{ and } \delta > \frac{n}{p'}. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, this follows from Corollary 3 together with the fact that one of the parameters γ, δ must be negative since the case $\gamma \geq 0, \delta \geq 0$ of Theorem 9 has already been proved. So it remains to complete the proof in each of these four cases, and by symmetry, it suffices to consider just the first case.

We will also assume for the moment that $m = n$, although we often continue to write m and n separately for later reference, and we will treat the case $m \neq n$ at the end. So we now suppose that

$$\frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\gamma}{m} + \frac{1}{q'}, \qquad \gamma < 0 \text{ and } \delta > \frac{m}{p'},$$

which implies

$$\triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m) = \left(\gamma - \frac{m}{q}\right)_+ + \left(\delta - \frac{m}{p'}\right)_+ = \delta - \frac{m}{p'},$$

and hence that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma + \frac{\delta - \frac{m}{p'}}{m} &< \frac{\alpha}{m} = \Gamma + \frac{\gamma + \delta}{m} - \frac{\delta - \frac{m}{p'}}{m}, \\ \Gamma + \frac{\delta - \frac{m}{p'}}{m} &\leq \frac{\beta}{m} \leq \Gamma + \frac{\gamma + \delta}{m} - \frac{\delta - \frac{m}{p'}}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can write

$$\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m,m) = \left[m\Gamma_{p,q} + \delta - \frac{m}{p'},\ m\Gamma_{p,q} + \gamma + \frac{m}{p'}\right],$$

where we are now writing $\Gamma_{p,q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}$ in preparation for changing p and q to new values $\widehat{p}$ and $\widehat{q}$.

We now increase q a small amount to $\widehat{q}$, and decrease p a small amount to $\widehat{p}$, i.e.

$$q \leq \widehat{q} \text{ and } \widehat{p} \leq p,$$

and we also decrease both γ and δ a small amount to $\widehat{\gamma}$ and $\widehat{\delta}$ respectively, so that altogether we have

$$\begin{aligned} q &\leq \widehat{q} \text{ and } \widehat{p} \leq p, \\ \gamma &\geq \widehat{\gamma} \text{ and } \delta \geq \widehat{\delta}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.33}$$

which implies that

$$\Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} \geq \Gamma_{p,q} \text{ and } \widehat{\gamma} + \widehat{\delta} \leq \gamma + \delta.$$

Note that we can arrange to have the power weight equality

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} + \frac{\widehat{\gamma} + \widehat{\delta}}{m+n} &= \Gamma_{p,q} + \frac{\gamma + \delta}{m+n} = \frac{\alpha + \beta}{m+n}; \\ \text{i.e. } \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} - \Gamma_{p,q} &= \frac{(\gamma + \delta) - \left(\widehat{\gamma} + \widehat{\delta}\right)}{m+n}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.34}$$

hold for the new parameters $\widehat{p},\widehat{q},\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}$, and we assume this is in force for the rest of the argument.

We then choose $\widehat{q},\widehat{\gamma}$ to satisfy in addition the key inequality,

$$0 \leq \frac{\gamma-\widehat{\gamma}}{m} < \frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\widehat{q}}, \tag{8.35}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}+\frac{\widehat{\gamma}}{m}+\frac{1}{\widehat{p}'} &= \frac{\widehat{\gamma}}{m}+1-\frac{1}{\widehat{q}} \\ &> \frac{\gamma}{m}+1-\frac{1}{q} = \Gamma_{p,q}+\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{p'}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.36}$$

We claim that (8.35) also implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}-1+\frac{\widehat{\delta}}{m}+\frac{1}{\widehat{p}} &< \Gamma_{p,q}-1+\frac{\delta}{m}+\frac{1}{p}, \\ \text{i.e. } \frac{2}{\widehat{p}}-\frac{1}{\widehat{q}}+\frac{\widehat{\delta}}{m} &< \frac{2}{p}-\frac{1}{q}+\frac{\delta}{m}, \\ \text{i.e. } 0 &\leq 2\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}}-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\left(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right) < \frac{\delta-\widehat{\delta}}{m}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.37}$$

Indeed, from the power weight equalities in (8.34) we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}}-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\left(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right) = \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}-\Gamma_{p,q} = \frac{\left(\delta-\widehat{\delta}\right)+(\gamma-\widehat{\gamma})}{2m},$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} 2\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}}-\frac{1}{p}\right)+2\left(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right) &= \frac{\left(\delta-\widehat{\delta}\right)+(\gamma-\widehat{\gamma})}{m} < \frac{\delta-\widehat{\delta}}{m}+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\widehat{q}}; \\ \text{i.e. } 2\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}}-\frac{1}{p}\right)+\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\widehat{q}} &< \frac{\delta-\widehat{\delta}}{m}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (8.37).

Thus the new interval $\mathcal{I}_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}^{\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}}(m,m)$ is *strictly* larger than $\mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m,m)$ in the strong sense that $\mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m,m)$ is contained in the interior of $\mathcal{I}_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}^{\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}}(m,m)$:

$$\left[\Gamma_{p,q}+\frac{\delta}{m}-\frac{1}{p'},\ \Gamma_{p,q}+\frac{\gamma}{m}+\frac{1}{p'}\right] \subset \left(\Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}+\frac{\widehat{\delta}}{m}-\frac{1}{\widehat{p}'},\ \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}+\frac{\widehat{\gamma}}{m}+\frac{1}{\widehat{p}'}\right).$$

So we conclude that after choosing $\widehat{p},\widehat{q},\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}$ as above, *but so close to* p,q,γ,δ that $\triangle_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}^{\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}}(m) = \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m)$, the conditions in (4.13) for the new parameters $\widehat{p},\widehat{q},\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}$ become

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} &= \frac{\alpha+\beta-\widehat{\gamma}-\widehat{\delta}}{m+n}, \\ \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}+\frac{\triangle_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}^{\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}}(m)}{m} &< \frac{\alpha}{m} < \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}+\frac{\widehat{\gamma}+\widehat{\delta}}{m}-\frac{\triangle_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}^{\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}}(m)}{m}, \\ \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}+\frac{\triangle_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}^{\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}}(m)}{m} &< \frac{\beta}{m} < \Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}+\frac{\widehat{\gamma}+\widehat{\delta}}{m}-\frac{\triangle_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}^{\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}}(m)}{m}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.38}$$

with *strict* inequalities, and the local integrability conditions

$$\widehat{\gamma}\widehat{q} < m+n \text{ and } \widehat{\delta}\widehat{p}' < m+n, \tag{8.39}$$

also remain in force.

Recall now that we defined $w_\gamma(z) = |z|^{-\gamma}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $v_\delta(z) = |z|^\delta = w_{-\delta}(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$. With these definitions in mind, we see that the cases of Theorem 9 already proved apply to yield $N_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(w_{-\widehat{\delta}}, w_{\widehat{\gamma}}\right) < \infty$.

This is equivalent to boundedness from $L^{\widehat{p}}$ to $L^{\widehat{q}}$ of the operator $S^{m,n}_{(\alpha,\beta),\left(\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}\right)}$ with kernel $w_{\widehat{\gamma}}(z)\, I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta}(z-\zeta)\, w_{\widehat{\delta}}(\zeta)$. By adjusting the parameters $(\widehat{p},\widehat{q},)$ and $\left(\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}\right)$ slightly as above, so that (8.33) is satisfied, and then interpolating with respect to the real method, see e.g. [BeLo]), we conclude that $S^{m,n}_{(\alpha,\beta),\left(\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}\right)}$ is bounded from the weak space $L^{\widehat{p},\infty}$ to the weak space $L^{\widehat{q},\infty}$. Now we apply the weak Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_\theta f\|_{L^{q,\infty}} &\leq 2C_q \|f\|_{L^{\widehat{q},\infty}} \text{ for all } f \in L^{\widehat{q},\infty}, \\ \text{provided } \widehat{q},q &> 0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{\widehat{q}} + \frac{\theta}{m} \text{ and } \theta > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and its companion

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_\eta f\|_{L^{\widehat{p},\infty}} &\leq 2C_q \|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \text{ for all } f \in L^{p,\infty}, \\ \text{provided } \widehat{p},p &> 0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{\widehat{p}} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{\eta}{n} \text{ and } \eta > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| w_\theta S^{m,n}_{(\alpha,\beta),\left(\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}\right)} w_\eta f \right\|_{L^{q,\infty}} &\leq 2C_q \left\| S^{m,n}_{(\alpha,\beta),\left(\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}\right)} w_\eta f \right\|_{L^{\widehat{q},\infty}} \\ &\leq 2C_q C_S \|w_\eta f\|_{L^{\widehat{p},\infty}} \leq 2C_q C_S 2C_{\widehat{p}} \|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \ , \end{aligned}$$

provided

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{q} &= \frac{1}{\widehat{q}} + \frac{\theta}{m} \text{ and } \theta \geq 0, \\ \frac{1}{\widehat{p}} &= \frac{1}{p} + \frac{\eta}{n} \text{ and } \eta \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w_\theta S^{m,n}_{(\alpha,\beta),\left(\widehat{\gamma},\widehat{\delta}\right)} w_\eta f &= w_\theta(z)\, w_{\widehat{\gamma}}(z)\, I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta}(z-\zeta)\, w_{\widehat{\delta}}(\zeta)\, w_\eta(\zeta) \\ &= w_{\theta+\widehat{\gamma}}(z)\, I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta}(z-\zeta)\, w_{\widehat{\delta}+\eta}(\zeta) = w_\gamma(z)\, I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta}(z-\zeta)\, w_\delta(\zeta) \end{aligned}$$

provided

$$\begin{aligned} \theta + \widehat{\gamma} &= \gamma \text{ and } \widehat{\delta} + \eta = \delta, \\ \gamma - \widehat{\gamma} &= \theta \geq 0 \text{ and } \delta - \widehat{\delta} = \eta \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in the case $m = n$ we have proved that

$$\left\| \left(w_\gamma I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta} w_{-\delta} \right) f \right\|_{L^{q,\infty}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \ ,$$

for all parameters p, q, γ, δ satisfying $p \leq q$ and finiteness of $A^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}_{p,q}(w_\gamma, w_{-\delta})$, including the power weight equality and the endpoint equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{p,q} + \frac{\gamma+\delta}{m+n} &= \frac{\alpha+\beta}{m+n}, \\ \frac{\alpha}{m} &= \frac{\gamma}{m} + \frac{1}{q'}. \end{aligned}$$

If we now also fix $\Gamma_{p,q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}$, there is still one degree of freedom left open in the choice of parameters p, q, γ, δ, and then using the Stein-Weiss interpolation with change of measure theorem [StWe1] yields

$$\left\| \left(w_\gamma I^{m,n}_{\alpha,\beta} w_{-\delta} \right) f \right\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p} \ .$$

This last inequality is equivalent to the power weight norm inequality (4.14), and this completes the proof of the exceptional cases when $m = n$.

Finally, we consider the case $m \neq n$. Again we suppose we are in the first exceptional case where

$$\frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\gamma}{m} + \frac{1}{q'}, \qquad \gamma < 0 \text{ and } \delta > \frac{m}{p'}.$$

When $\delta > \frac{\max\{m,n\}}{p'}$, the arguments above apply verbatim to prove that the power weight norm inequality (4.14) holds. On the other hand, if $\frac{m}{p'} < \delta \leq \frac{n}{p'}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m) &= \left(\gamma - \frac{m}{q}\right)_+ + \left(\delta - \frac{m}{p'}\right)_+ = \delta - \frac{m}{p'}, \\ \triangle_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n) &= \left(\gamma - \frac{n}{q}\right)_+ + \left(\delta - \frac{n}{p'}\right)_+ = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and (8.32) for p, q, γ, δ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\in \mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m,n) \equiv \left[m\Gamma_{p,q},\ m\Gamma_{p,q} + \gamma + \frac{m}{p'}\right], \\ \beta &\in \mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n,m) \equiv \left[n\Gamma_{p,q} + \delta - \frac{m}{p'},\ n\Gamma_{p,q} + \gamma + \delta\right]. \end{aligned}$$

where α equals the right hand endpoint of $\mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m,n)$ by assumption, and β is *strictly* less than the right hand endpoint of $\mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m,n)$ by (8.8) since $\delta \leq \frac{n}{p'}$:

$$\alpha = m\Gamma_{p,q} + \gamma + \frac{m}{p'} \text{ and } \beta < n\Gamma_{p,q} + \gamma + \delta. \tag{8.40}$$

We use the same adjustments to $\widehat{p}, \widehat{q}, \widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\delta}$ as used above in the case $m = n$, with the key restriction (8.35), i.e.

$$\gamma - \widehat{\gamma} < m\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right), \tag{8.41}$$

but now with the *additional restriction* that

$$\delta - \widehat{\delta} > (m+n)\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}} - \frac{1}{p}\right) + n\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right). \tag{8.42}$$

This is possible since the identity

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{(m+n)\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}} - \frac{1}{p}\right) + n\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right)\right\} + \left\{m\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right)\right\} \\ = \ & (m+n)\left(\Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} - \Gamma_{p,q}\right) = \left\{\delta - \widehat{\delta}\right\} + \left\{\gamma - \widehat{\gamma}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

leaves room to permit (8.42) and (8.41) to hold simultaneously provided we keep $\Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} - \Gamma_{p,q}$ sufficiently small.

Recall from the case $m = n$ that the right hand endpoint $m\Gamma_{p,q} + \gamma + \frac{m}{p'}$ of $\mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(m,n)$ increases to $m\Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} + \widehat{\gamma} + \frac{m}{\widehat{p}'}$ under the assumption (8.41). The left hand endpoint $n\Gamma_{p,q} + \delta - \frac{m}{p'}$ of $\mathcal{I}_{p,q}^{\gamma,\delta}(n,m)$ now *decreases* to $n\Gamma_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} + \widehat{\delta} - \frac{m}{\widehat{p}'}$ under the assumption (8.42):

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[n\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}} - \frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right) + \widehat{\delta} - \frac{m}{\widehat{p}'}\right] - \left[n\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right) + \delta - \frac{m}{p'}\right] \\ = \ & n\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}} - \frac{1}{p}\right) + n\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\widehat{q}}\right) - \left(\delta - \widehat{\delta}\right) + m\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{p}} - \frac{1}{p}\right) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we see from this and (8.40) that (8.38) holds with *strict* inequalities for a sufficiently small adjustment of parameters, and the local integrability conditions (8.39) also remain in force. Now we can continue with the argument as in the case $m = n$ above, and this completes the proof of Theorem 9.

9. Proof of Theorem 10

Define the eccentricity $\varkappa(R)$ of a rectangle $R = I \times J$ to be $\varkappa(R) = \frac{\ell(I)}{\ell(J)}$. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ define the conical operator $\triangle_j I_{\alpha,\beta}$ acting on a measure μ by

$$\triangle_j I_{\alpha,\beta}\mu(x,y) \equiv \iint\limits_{\mathbb{S}_j + (x,y)} \left(\frac{1}{|x-u|}\right)^{m-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{|y-t|}\right)^{n-\beta} d\mu(u,t),$$

where $\mathbb{S}_j \equiv \left\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-j-1} \leq \frac{|y|}{|x|} < 2^{-j+1}\right\}$ is a cone with aperature roughly 2^{-j} and slope roughly 2^{-j}.

Lemma 5. *Suppose $1 < p < q < \infty$, $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ and that both σ and ω are rectangle doubling, and that the reverse doubling exponent ε for σ satisfies*

$$1 - \varepsilon < \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}.$$

For $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \frac{\alpha}{m} = \frac{\beta}{n}$ we have

$$\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left| \triangle_j I_{\alpha,\beta} \left(\mathbf{1}_R \sigma \right)(x,y) \right|^q d\omega(x,y) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim 2^{-\varepsilon' |j-k|} \left(\iint_R d\sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{9.1}$$

for all rectangles R with eccentricity $\varkappa(R) = 2^{-k}$, and where $\varepsilon' > 0$ depends on $p, q, \alpha, \beta, \varepsilon$.

Proof. We will prove the special case when $\ell(I) = 1$ and $\varkappa(R) = 1$, i.e. R is a square of side length 1. The general case is similar. We now place the origin so that R is the block $B_0 = [1,2]^m \times [1,2]^n$.

We first consider the region $\mathcal{R}_1 \equiv \left\{(x,y) : |x| \leq \frac{1}{4}|y|\right\}$. In this region the sum over $j < 0$ is easy. So we consider $j > 0$. To see that (9.1) holds with integration on the left restricted to $\mathcal{R}_1$, we begin by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \triangle_j I_{\alpha,\beta} \left(\mathbf{1}_R \sigma \right)(x,y) &= \iint_{R \cap \{\mathbb{S}_j + (x,y)\}} \left(\frac{1}{|x-u|} \right)^{m-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{|y-t|} \right)^{n-\beta} d\sigma(u,t) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^{2^j} \left[\iint_{R(r)} \left(\frac{1}{|x-u|} \right)^{m-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{|y-t|} \right)^{n-\beta} d\sigma(u,t) \right] \mathbf{1}_{R^*(r)}(x,y), \end{aligned}$$

where the tiles $R(r)$ are rectangles of size 1 by 2^{-j} and the tiles $R^*(r)$ are slightly enlarged reflections of the $R(r)$ centered on the y-axis. Now we continue by computing

$$\begin{aligned} &\iint_{\mathcal{R}_1} \left| \triangle_j I_{\alpha,\beta} \left(\mathbf{1}_R \sigma \right)(x,y) \right|^q d\omega(x,y) \\ &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sum_{r=1}^{2^j} \left[\iint_{R(r)} \left(\frac{1}{|x-u|} \right)^{m-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{|y-t|} \right)^{n-\beta} d\sigma(u,t) \right] \mathbf{1}_{R^*(r)}(x,y) \right\}^q d\omega(x,y) \\ &\approx \sum_{r=1}^{2^j} \iint_{R^*(r)} \left\{ \iint_{R(r)} \left(\frac{1}{|x-u|} \right)^{m-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{|y-t|} \right)^{n-\beta} d\sigma(u,t) \right\}^q d\omega(x,y), \end{aligned}$$

where matters have been reduced to the diagonal terms since $R^*(r) \cap R^*(s) = \emptyset$ unless $|r-s| \leq c_0$ (this follows easily from the fact that the tiles $R(r)$ are pairwise disjoint in r). Now we apply Hölder's inequality

to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
(9.2)\qquad & \iint\limits_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n} \left|I_{\alpha,\beta}\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_0}\sigma\right)\right|^q w^q \\
&\lesssim \sum_{r=1}^{2^j} \iint\limits_{R^*(r)} \left\{\iint\limits_{R(r)} d\sigma\right\}^{\frac{q}{p}} \left\{\iint\limits_{R(r)} \left(\frac{1}{|x-u|}\right)^{(m-\alpha)p'} \left(\frac{1}{|y-t|}\right)^{(n-\beta)p'} d\sigma(u,t)\right\}^{\frac{q}{p'}} w(x,y)^q\,dxdy \\
&\lesssim \left(A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\beta}\right)^q \sum_{r=1}^{2^j} \left\{\iint\limits_{R(r)} d\sigma\right\}^{\frac{q}{p}} = \left(A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\beta}\right)^q \sum_{r=1}^{2^j} \left\{\iint\limits_{R(r)} d\sigma\right\}^{\frac{q}{p}-1} \left(\iint\limits_{R(r)} d\sigma\right) \\
&\lesssim \left(A_{p,q}^{\alpha,\beta}\right)^q \sum_{r=1}^{2^j} \left\{2^{-\varepsilon j}\iint\limits_{R} d\sigma\right\}^{\frac{q}{p}-1} \left(\iint\limits_{R(r)} d\sigma\right) = 2^{-\varepsilon' j}\left(\iint\limits_{R} d\sigma\right)^{\frac{q}{p}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we consider the region $\mathcal{R}_2 \equiv \left\{(x,y) : \frac{1}{4}|y| \le |x| \le 4|y|\right\}$. Here we must perform an additional calculation involving the intersection of the tile $R(r)$ and the cone $\mathbb{S}_j + (x,y)$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\iint\limits_{\mathcal{R}_2} \left|\triangle_j I_{\alpha,\beta}\left(\mathbf{1}_{R(r)\cap[\mathbb{S}_j+(x,y)]}\sigma\right)(x,y)\right|^q d\omega(x,y) \\
&= \iint\limits_{\mathcal{R}_2} \left\{\sum_{r=1}^{2^j} \left[\iint\limits_{R(r)\cap[\mathbb{S}_j+(x,y)]} \left(\frac{1}{|x-u|}\right)^{m-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{|y-t|}\right)^{n-\beta} d\sigma(u,t)\right] \mathbf{1}_{R^*(r)}(x,y)\right\}^q d\omega(x,y),
\end{aligned}
$$

where now $R^*(r)$ can overlap $R(r)$ considerably. However, for each fixed $(x,y) \in R(r)$ we further decompose

$$
R(r)\cap[\mathbb{S}_j+(x,y)] = \bigcup_{\ell} R_\ell(r)
$$

where the widths of the $R_\ell(r)$ form a geometric sequence that approaches 0 as $R_\ell(r)$ approaches (x,y), and the dependence of $R_\ell(r)$ on (x,y) is suppressed. Moreover, the tiles $R_\ell(r)$ are roughly rectangles of dimension $2^{-\ell}\times 2^{-\ell-j}$, and so

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\iint\limits_{R(r)\cap[\mathbb{S}_j+(x,y)]} \left(\frac{1}{|x-u|}\right)^{m-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{|y-t|}\right)^{n-\beta} d\sigma(u,t) \lesssim \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \iint\limits_{R_\ell(r)} \left(\frac{1}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{m-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{2^{-\ell-j}}\right)^{n-\beta} d\sigma(u,t) \\
\approx\ & 2^{j(n-\beta)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} 2^{\ell(m-\alpha+n-\beta)} \left|R_\ell(r)\right|_\sigma \lesssim 2^{j(n-\beta)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} 2^{\ell(m-\alpha+n-\beta)} \left(2^{-\varepsilon(m\ell+n\ell+jn)}\left|R\right|_\sigma\right) \\
\lesssim\ & 2^{j(n-\beta-\varepsilon n)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} 2^{\ell(m-\alpha+n-\beta-(m+n)\varepsilon)} \left|R\right|_\sigma \approx 2^{jn\left(1-\frac{\beta}{n}-\varepsilon\right)} \left|R\right|_\sigma
\end{aligned}
$$

provided $1-\varepsilon<\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iint_{\mathcal{R}_2}\left|\triangle_j I_{\alpha,\beta}\left(\mathbf{1}_R\sigma\right)\right|^q d\omega\\
&= \iint_{\mathcal{R}_2}\left\{\sum_{r=1}^{2^j}\sum_{\ell=1}^{N}\left[\iint_{R_\ell(r)\cap[\mathbb{S}_j+(x,y)]}\left(\frac{1}{|x-u|}\right)^{m-\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{|y-t|}\right)^{n-\beta}d\sigma\left(u,t\right)\right]\mathbf{1}_{R_\ell^*(r)}\left(x,y\right)\right\}^q d\omega\left(x,y\right)\\
&\lesssim \iint_{\mathcal{R}_2}\left\{\sum_{r=1}^{2^j}\sum_{\ell=1}^{N}\left[2^{jn\left(1-\frac{\beta}{n}-\varepsilon\right)}\left|R\right|_\sigma\right]\mathbf{1}_{R_\ell^*(r)}\left(x,y\right)\right\}^q d\omega\left(x,y\right)\\
&\lesssim \sum_{r=1}^{2^j}\iint_{\mathcal{R}_2}\left\{\sum_{\ell=1}^{N}\left[2^{jn\left(1-\frac{\beta}{n}-\varepsilon\right)}\left|R\right|_\sigma\right]\mathbf{1}_{R_\ell^*(r)}\left(x,y\right)\right\}^q d\omega\left(x,y\right)\\
&\approx \sum_{r=1}^{2^j}\sum_{\ell=1}^{N}\iint_{\mathcal{R}_2}\left\{\left[2^{jn\left(1-\frac{\beta}{n}-\varepsilon\right)}\left|R\right|_\sigma\right]\mathbf{1}_{R_\ell^*(r)}\left(x,y\right)\right\}^q d\omega\left(x,y\right),
\end{aligned}$$

since the $R_\ell^*\left(r\right)$ are essentially pairwise disjoint in both r and ℓ (there is also decay in the kernel in the parameter ℓ). Now we apply Hölder's inequality and continue as in (9.2) above.

Region $\mathcal{R}_3\equiv\{(x,y):|x|\leq 4\,|y|\}$ is handled symmetrically to Region $\mathcal{R}_1$, and this completes the proof of Lemma 5. □

Now we can easily obtain the testing condition.

Corollary 4. *Suppose $1<p<q<\infty$, $0<\alpha,\beta<1$ and that both σ and ω are rectangle doubling, and that the reverse doubling exponent ε for σ satisfies*

$$1-\varepsilon<\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n}.$$

For $\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}<\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n}$ we have the testing condition

$$\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\left|I_{\alpha,\beta}\left(\mathbf{1}_R\sigma\right)\right|^q d\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\lesssim\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\sigma,\omega\right)\left(\iint_R d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},\qquad \text{for all } R=I\times J,$$

as well as the dual testing condition in which the roles of the measures σ and ω are reversed, and the exponents p,q are replaced with q',p' respectively.

Proof. We prove the testing condition, and leave the dual testing condition to the reader. Suppose that R has eccentricity $\varkappa\left(R\right)=2^{-k}$. Then from Minkowski's inequality and Lemma 5 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\left|I_{\alpha,\beta}\left(\mathbf{1}_R\sigma\right)\right|^q d\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} &= \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\left|\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}I_{\alpha,\beta}\left(\mathbf{1}_R\sigma\right)\right|^q d\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\leq \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\left|I_{\alpha,\beta}\left(\mathbf{1}_R\sigma\right)\right|^q d\omega\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\leq \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}2^{-\varepsilon'|j-k|}\left(\iint_R d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}=C_{\varepsilon'}\left(\iint_R d\sigma\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

10. Appendix

10.1. **Sharpness in the Muckenhoupt-Wheeden theorem.** Here we give a sharp form of the Muckenhoupt-Wheeden Theorem 1.

Theorem 13. *Let $0 < \alpha < m$, $1 < p, q < \infty$, and let $w(x)$ be a nonnegative weight on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then*

$$\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m f(x)^q \ w(x)^q \ dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w) \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x)^p \ w(x)^p \ dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{10.1}$$

for all $f \geq 0$ and $N_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w) < \infty$ if and only if both

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha}{m}, \tag{10.2}$$

and

$$A_{p,q}(w) \equiv \sup_{cubes\ I \subset \mathbb{R}^m} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w(x)^q \ dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w(x)^{-p'} \ dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} < \infty.$$

Proof. Given Theorem 1, it remains only to prove that (10.2) is necessary for (10.1). To see this, we apply Hölder's inequality with dual exponents $\frac{p'+1}{p'}$ and $p'+1$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \left\{ \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w^{\frac{p'}{p'+1}} w^{-\frac{p'}{p'+1}} \right\}^{\frac{p'+1}{p'}} \\ &\leq \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w \right)^{\frac{p'}{p'+1}} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'+1}} \right\}^{\frac{p'+1}{p'}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w \right) \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we conclude that

$$|I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m} - 1 + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'}} \leq |I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m} - 1 + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'}} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w^{-p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \leq N_{p,q}^{\alpha,m}(w)$$

for all cubes I, which implies $\frac{\alpha}{m} - 1 + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} = 0$ as required. □

10.2. **Sharpness in the Stein-Weiss theorem.** Here we give a sharp form of the Stein-Weiss Theorem 3.

Theorem 14. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} -\infty &< \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta < \infty, \\ 1 &< p, q < \infty, \\ m &\in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the power weighted norm inequality

$$\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m f(x)^q \ |x|^{-\gamma q} \ dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq N_{p,q}(w,v) \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x)^p \ |x|^{\delta p} \ dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \qquad \text{for all } f \geq 0, \tag{10.3}$$

holds if and only if *the power weight equality*

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{\alpha - (\gamma + \delta)}{m} \tag{10.4}$$

holds along with the constraint inequalities,

$$0 < \alpha < m, \tag{10.5}$$

$$p \leq q, \tag{10.6}$$

$$q\gamma < m, \tag{10.7}$$

$$p'\delta < m, \tag{10.8}$$

and

$$\gamma + \delta \geq 0. \tag{10.9}$$

Proof. The sufficiency of these conditions for (10.3) is the classical theorem of Stein and Weiss, so we turn to proving their necessity. The required local integrability of the power weights $|x|^{-\gamma q}$ and $|x|^{-\delta p'}$ shows that (10.7) and (10.8) hold. The kernel $|x-y|^{\alpha-m}$ of the convolution operator must be locally integrable on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and this implies that $0 < \alpha$. Using this, we can now use the argument in the proof of Proposition 2 to prove that finiteness of the Muckenhoupt characteristic $A_{p,q}(w,v)$ is necessary, and this in turn implies both (10.9) and the power weight equality (10.4) just as in the proof of Theorem 8 above for the 2-parameter case. From (10.4), (10.7) and (10.8) we now obtain

$$\alpha = m\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right) + (\gamma+\delta) < m\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right) + \left(\frac{m}{q}+\frac{m}{p'}\right) = m,$$

which completes the proof that (10.5) holds.

Finally we turn to proving (10.6). Let $f(y) = f(s)$, $s = |y|$, be a radial function on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then $I_\alpha f(x) = I_\alpha f(r)$, $r = |x|$, is also radial and

$$I_\alpha f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |x-y|^{\alpha-m} f(y)\, dy \gtrsim \int_{|y|\leq|x|} |x|^{\alpha-m} f(y)\, dy = r^{\alpha-m}\int_0^r f(s)\, s^{m-1} ds.$$

Now suppose, in order to derive a contradiction, that (10.3) holds. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{\int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^r f(s)\, s^{m-1} ds\right)^q \; r^{(\alpha-m)q-\gamma q}\; r^{n-1} dr\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} I_\alpha^m f(x)^q \;\; |x|^{-\gamma q} \;\; dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&\qquad \leq N_{p,q}(w,v)\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x)^p \;\; |x|^{\delta p} \;\; dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} = N_{p,q}(w,v)\left\{\int_0^\infty f(s) \;\; s^{\delta p+m-1} ds\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $f \geq 0$. With $g(s) \equiv f(s)\, s^{m-1}$, this last inequality can be rewritten as

$$\left\{\int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^r g(s)\, ds\right)^q \;\; v(r)\, dr\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim N_{p,q}(w,v)\left\{\int_0^\infty g(s) \;\; u(s)\, ds\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{10.10}$$

for all $g \geq 0$, and where the weights are given by $v(r) = r^{(\alpha-m)q-\gamma q+n-1}$ and $u(s) = s^{\delta p}$. By a result of Maz'ja [Maz], the two weight Hardy inequality (10.10) with $q < p$ holds if and only if

$$\int_0^\infty \left[\left(\int_0^r u^{1-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left(\int_r^\infty v\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right]^\rho v(r)\, dr < \infty,$$

where $\frac{1}{\rho} = \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} > 0$. But since the weights u and v are power functions, the integrand above is also a power function, and hence cannot belong to any Lebesgue space $L^\rho(0,\infty)$, thus providing the required contradiction. □

10.3. **Optimal powers of Muckenhoupt characteristics.** Recall the one parameter two-tailed characteristic $\widehat{A}_{p,q}$ given above by

$$\widehat{A}_{p,q}(v,w) \equiv \sup_{Q\subset\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\widehat{s}_Q(x)\, w(x)]^q \;\; dx\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[\widehat{s}_Q(x)\, v(x)^{-1}\right]^{p'} \;\; dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}},$$

where

$$\widehat{s}_Q(x) \equiv \left(1 + \frac{|x-c_Q|}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\alpha-n}, \qquad c_Q \text{ is the center of } Q,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{q} &= \frac{1}{p} - \frac{\alpha}{n}, \\
\text{i.e. } \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p'} &= 1 - \frac{\alpha}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 2 we know that the characteristic $\widehat{A}_{p,q}(w,v)$ is finite *if and only if* the following norm inequality for the fractional integral I_α^n holds:

$$\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I_\alpha^n f(x)^q \ w(x)^q \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C_{p,q}(v,w)\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)^p \ v(x)^p \ dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{10.11}$$

Moreover, it is claimed there that

$$C_{p,q}(v,w) \approx \widehat{A}_{p,q}(v,w), \tag{10.12}$$

and this equivalence can be verified by carefully tracking the constants in the proof of Theorem 1 in [SaWh]. We also have the same consequence for the one-tailed characteristic.

Porism: The same arguments as used in the proof of Theorem 1 in [SaWh] also prove that

$$C_{\alpha,\beta}(v,w) \approx \overline{A}_{p,q}(v,w),$$

where $\overline{A}_{p,q}$ is the one-tailed characteristic,

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{A}_{p,q}(v,w) &= \sup_{Q\subset\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_Q^{p'}v^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &\quad+\sup_{Q\subset\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_Q^{q}w^{q}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q v^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}.\end{aligned}$$

10.3.1. *Comparison with the inequality of Lacey, Moen, Pérez and Torres.* Here we give a simple and instructive proof of the 'A_1 conjecture' in the setting of fractional integrals. Recall that from [LaMoPeTo] we have the estimate

$$C_{p,q}(w) \lesssim A_{p,q}(w)^{1+\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q},\frac{q}{p'}\right\}}, \tag{10.13}$$

and if we restrict the two weight result above to the case $w=v$, we have the equivalence

$$C_{\alpha,\beta}(w,w) \approx \widehat{A}_{p,q}(w,w).$$

Thus the estimate (10.13) is equivalent to

$$\widehat{A}_{p,q}(w) \lesssim A_{p,q}(w)^{\rho}, \tag{10.14}$$

and also equivalent to

$$\overline{A}_{p,q}(w) \lesssim A_{p,q}(w)^{\rho}, \tag{10.15}$$

where $\rho \equiv 1+\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q},\frac{q}{p'}\right\}$. Written out in full, one half of inequality (10.15) is

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{Q\subset\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_Q^{q}w^{q}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &\lesssim \left\{\sup_{Q\subset\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\right\}^{\rho}.\end{aligned} \tag{10.16}$$

Claim 2. *The inequality (10.15) holds directly, without any reference to norm inequalities at all.*

Proof. Take the q^{th} power of the left hand side of (10.16) and fix a cube Q which comes close to achieving the supremum over all cubes. Then we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_Q^q w^q\right)\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{q}{p'}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{q}{p'}}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{k[(\alpha-n)q+n]}\frac{1}{|2^kQ|}\int_{2^kQ}w^q \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{q}{p'}}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}2^{k[(\alpha-n)q+n]}A_{p,q}(w)^q\left(\frac{1}{|2^kQ|}\int_{2^kQ}w^{-p'}\right)^{-\frac{q}{p'}} \\
&= A_{p,q}(w)^q\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{|Q|_{w^{-p'}}}{|2^kQ|_{w^{-p'}}}\right)^{\frac{q}{p'}} \lesssim A_{p,q}(w)^q\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(2^{-k\delta}\right)^{\frac{q}{p'}} \\
&\lesssim A_{p,q}(w)^q\frac{1}{1-2^{-\delta\frac{q}{p'}}} \approx A_{p,q}(w)^q\frac{1}{\delta},
\end{aligned} \tag{10.17}$$

where δ is the reverse doubling exponent for the A_p weight $w^{-p'}$,

$$|Q|_{w^{-p'}} \le C2^{-k\delta}\left|2^kQ\right|_{w^{-p'}} \text{ for all cubes } Q.$$

Now we claim that the reverse doubling exponents $\delta = \delta\left(w^{-p'}\right)$ and $\delta(w^q)$ for the weights $w^{-p'}$ and w^q satisfy

$$\frac{1}{\delta\left(w^{-p'}\right)} \le C_{p,q,n}\ A_{p,q}(w)^{p'} \text{ and } \frac{1}{\delta(w^q)} \le C_{p,q,n}\ A_{p,q}(w)^q. \tag{10.18}$$

Indeed, we have for all $f \ge 0$ and any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q f\right)\left(\int_Q w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q (f^\varepsilon w)\left(f^{1-\varepsilon}\right)\left(w^{-1}\right)\right)\left(\int_Q w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&\le \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q (f^\varepsilon w)^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \left(f^{1-\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{pq}{q-p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\int_Q w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\int_Q f^{\varepsilon q}w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q f^{(1-\varepsilon)\frac{pq}{q-p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} \\
&\le A_{p,q}(w)\left(\int_Q f^{\varepsilon q}w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q f^{(1-\varepsilon)\frac{pq}{q-p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}},
\end{aligned}$$

and now plugging in $f = \mathbf{1}_{\frac{1}{3}Q}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\left|\frac{1}{3}Q\right|}{|Q|}\right)\left(\int_Q w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} &\le A_{p,q}(w)\left(\int_{\frac{1}{3}Q}w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{\left|\frac{1}{3}Q\right|}{|Q|}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}}; \\
\frac{|Q|_{w^q}}{\left|\frac{1}{3}Q\right|_{w^q}} &\le 3^{n\left(1+\frac{q}{p'}\right)}A_{p,q}(w)^q.
\end{aligned}$$

With $\ell(Q)$ denoting the side length of Q, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|3Q|_{w^q} &\le \sum_{\alpha\in\{-1,0,1\}^n\setminus(0,\dots,0)}|3(Q+\ell(Q)\mathbf{e}_1)|_{w^q} \\
&\le \sum_{\alpha\in\{-1,0,1\}^n\setminus(0,\dots,0)}3^{n\left(1+\frac{q}{p'}\right)}A_{p,q}(w)^q|Q+\ell(Q)\mathbf{e}_1|_{w^q} \\
&= 3^{n\left(1+\frac{q}{p'}\right)}A_{p,q}(w)^q|3Q\setminus Q|_{w^q},
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\frac{|Q|_{w^q}}{|3Q|_{w^q}} = \frac{|3Q|_{w^q} - |3Q \setminus Q|_{w^q}}{|3Q|_{w^q}} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{3^{n\left(1+\frac{q}{p'}\right)} A_{p,q}(w)^q} \equiv \gamma.$$

Iterating, we get

$$\frac{\left|\frac{1}{3^k}Q\right|_{w^q}}{|Q|_{w^q}} = \frac{\left|\frac{1}{3^k}Q\right|_{w^q}}{\left|\frac{1}{3^{k-1}}Q\right|_{w^q}} \frac{\left|\frac{1}{3^{k-1}}Q\right|_{w^q}}{\left|\frac{1}{3^{k-2}}Q\right|_{w^q}} ... \frac{\left|\frac{1}{3}Q\right|_{w^q}}{|Q|_{w^q}} \leq \gamma^k,$$

from which we obtain

$$\frac{\left|\frac{1}{2^k}Q\right|_{w^q}}{|Q|_{w^q}} = \frac{\left|\frac{1}{3^{\frac{\ln 2}{\ln 3}k}}Q\right|_{w^q}}{|Q|_{w^q}} \leq C\gamma^{\frac{\ln 2}{\ln 3}k} = C2^{\frac{\ln \gamma}{\ln 3}k} = C2^{-k\delta},$$

where

$$\delta = \delta(w^q) = \frac{\ln \frac{1}{\gamma}}{\ln 3} = \frac{1}{\ln 3} \ln \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{3^{n\left(1+\frac{q}{p'}\right)} A_{p,q}(w)^q}} \approx \frac{1}{A_{p,q}(w)^q}.$$

This proves the second assertion in (10.18), and the proof of the first assertion is similar.

Thus from (10.17) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{A}_{p,q}(w) &= \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \widehat{s}_Q^q w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q w^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
&\leq C_{p,q,n}\ A_{p,q}(w) \left(\frac{1}{\delta(w^{-p'})}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
&\leq C_{p,q,n}\ A_{p,q}(w)^{1+\frac{q}{p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we obtain that the expression

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{Q\subset\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \left[\widehat{s}_Q w^{-1}\right]^{p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
= &\sup_{Q\subset\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \left[\widehat{s}_Q w^{-1}\right]^{p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[w^{-1}\right]^{-(q')'}\right)^{\frac{1}{(q')'}}
\end{aligned}$$

is dominated by

$$C_{q',p',n}\ A_{q',p'}\left(w^{-1}\right)^{1+\frac{p'}{q}} = C_{p,q,n}\ A_{p,q}(w)^{1+\frac{p'}{q}}.$$

This completes the proof of the claim. □

Thus we have given in the Claim above a simple direct proof of the following theorem using the proof of Theorem 1 in [SaWh].

Theorem 15. *(Lacey, Moen, Pérez and Torres* [LaMoPeTo]*) With p, q, n as above we have*

$$C_{p,q}(w) \leq C_{p,q,n}\ A_{p,q}(w)^{1+\max\left\{\frac{p'}{q}, \frac{q}{p'}\right\}}.$$

10.4. **Doubling, reverse doubling and Muckenhoupt type conditions.** Recall the following doubling and rectangle doubling conditions (which perhaps ought to be referred to as 'tripling' rather than doubling conditions).

Definition 3. *We say that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the* doubling condition (D_{oub}) *with constant D if*

$$|3I|_\mu \leq D|I|_\mu, \qquad \text{for all cubes } I \subset \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for some constant $D > 1$; and we say that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the rectangle doubling condition ($R_{ect}D_{oub}$) *with constant pair (D_1, D_2) if*

$$\begin{aligned}
|3I \times J|_\mu &\leq D_1 |I \times J|_\mu, \qquad \text{for all cubes } I \subset \mathbb{R}^m, J \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \\
|I \times 3J|_\mu &\leq D_2 |I \times J|_\mu, \qquad \text{for all cubes } I \subset \mathbb{R}^m, J \subset \mathbb{R}^n.
\end{aligned}$$

If $D = D_1 = D_2$, then we say simply that D is the doubling constant for μ.

We will also consider the following reverse doubling condition with exponent $\varepsilon > 0$, and rectangle reverse doubling condition with exponent pair $\left(\varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2\right)$.

Definition 4. *We say that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ satisfies the* reverse doubling condition ($R_{ev}D_{oub}$) *with exponent $\varepsilon > 0$ if*

$$|sI|_\mu \leq Cs^{m\varepsilon} \ |I|_\mu \,, \qquad 0 < s < 1,$$

for some constant C; and we say that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the rectangle reverse doubling condition ($R_{ect}R_{ev}D_{oub}$) *with exponent pair $\left(\varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2\right)$ if*

$$|sI \times tJ|_\mu \leq Cs^{m\varepsilon^1} t^{n\varepsilon^2} \ |I \times J|_\mu \,, \qquad 0 < s, t < 1,$$

for some constant C. If $\varepsilon = \varepsilon^1 = \varepsilon^2$, then we say simply that ε is the reverse doubling exponent for μ.

We begin with the simple proof that doubling implies reverse doubling. Note that doubling measures cannot vanish on any open set, while reverse doubling measures can. In particular, Cantor measures are typically reverse doubling, while never doubling. We restrict attention here to the one-parameter situation for convenience only, the rectangle situation being an obvious consequence.

Lemma 6. *Suppose that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ satisfies the* doubling condition (D_{oub}) *with constant D. Then μ satisfies the* reverse doubling condition ($R_{ev}D_{oub}$) *with exponent*

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\ln \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{D}}}{\ln 3}.$$

Remark 7. *Note that for D large we have $\varepsilon \approx \frac{1}{D \ln 3}$. Thus if μ is a doubling measure with large doubling constant D, then μ is reverse doubling with exponent at least roughly $\frac{1}{D}$ (the exponent might be much larger of course depending on μ).*

Proof. Fix a cube $I \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ centered at the origin with side length $2\ell > 0$. Now consider the 2^m pairwise disjoint cubes $J_1, ..., J_{2^m}$ with side length 3ℓ and each having the origin at one of their vertices, so that $\bigcup_{k=1}^{2^m} J_k = 3I$. Then the cubes $\frac{1}{3}J_k$ are pairwise disjoint and contained in $3I \setminus I$. Thus from the doubling condition on μ with constant D, we have

$$|3I \setminus I|_\mu \geq \sum_{k=1}^{2^m} \left|\frac{1}{3}J_k\right|_\mu \geq \frac{1}{D}\sum_{k=1}^{2^m} |J_k|_\mu = \frac{1}{D}\,|3I|_\mu \ ,$$

which gives

$$|I|_\mu = |3I|_\mu - |3I \setminus I|_\mu \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{D}\right)|3I|_\mu \,,$$

for all cubes I centered at the origin, hence we conclude that

$$\left|\frac{1}{3}I\right|_\mu \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{D}\right)|I|_\mu \ , \qquad \text{for all cubes } I \subset \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Iterating this inequality yields

$$\left|\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^n I\right|_\mu \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{D}\right)^n |I|_\mu = \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{n\frac{\ln\left(1-\frac{1}{D}\right)}{\ln\frac{1}{3}}} |I|_\mu \ ,$$

and then

$$|sI|_\mu \leq Cs^{n\varepsilon}\,|I|_\mu \ , \qquad 0 < s < 1,$$

for some constant C, where

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\ln\left(1 - \frac{1}{D}\right)}{\ln\frac{1}{3}} = \frac{\ln\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{D}}}{\ln 3}.$$

□

Now we establish a necessary condition on the product reverse doubling exponents in order that the $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}$ condition holds.

Lemma 7. *Assume the weight pair (v,w) satisfies $A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)<\infty$, and in addition suppose that w^q and $v^{-p'}$ satisfy rectangle reverse doubling conditions with exponent pairs $\left(\varepsilon_w^1,\varepsilon_w^2\right)$ and $\left(\varepsilon_v^1,\varepsilon_v^2\right)$ respectively, i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned}\int\int_{2^{-i}I\times 2^{-j}J} w(x,y)^q\ dxdy &\leq C2^{-m\varepsilon_w^1 i-n\varepsilon_w^2 j}\int\int_{I\times J} w(x,y)^q\ dxdy,\\ \int\int_{2^{-i}I\times 2^{-j}J} v(x,y)^{-p'}\ dxdy &\leq C2^{-m\varepsilon_v^1 i-n\varepsilon_v^2 j}\int\int_{I\times J} v(x,y)^{-p'}\ dxdy,\end{aligned} \tag{10.19}$$

for some constant C. Then with $\eta=\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n}$, we have

$$\frac{\varepsilon_w^1}{q}+\frac{\varepsilon_v^1}{p'}\leq 1-\eta \text{ and } \frac{\varepsilon_w^2}{q}+\frac{\varepsilon_v^2}{p'}\leq 1-\eta.$$

Proof. Let $I_{\max}$ and $J_{\max}$ be such that

$$\frac{1}{2}A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)<\frac{\left(\iint_{I_{\max}\times J_{\max}} w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I_{\max}\times J_{\max}} v^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}}{|I_{\max}|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{m}}|J_{\max}|^{1-\frac{\beta}{n}}}\leq A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w)\ .$$

Then with $I=2^iI_{\max}$ and $J=2^jJ_{\max}$, the rectangle reverse doubling conditions on w and v give

$$\begin{aligned}A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w) &\geq \frac{\left(\iint_{I\times J} w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{I\times J} v^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}}{|I|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{m}}|J|^{1-\frac{\beta}{n}}}\geq \frac{\left(\frac{1}{C}2^{m\varepsilon_w^1 i+n\varepsilon_w^2 j}\iint_{I_{\max}\times J_{\max}} w^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{C}2^{m\varepsilon_v^1 i+n\varepsilon_v^2 j}\iint_{I_{\max}\times J_{\max}} v^{-p'}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}}{2^{i(m-\alpha)}|I_{\max}|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{m}}2^{j(n-\beta)}|J_{\max}|^{1-\frac{\beta}{n}}}\\ &> \frac{\left(\frac{1}{C}2^{m\varepsilon_w^1 i+n\varepsilon_w^2 j}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\frac{1}{C}2^{m\varepsilon_v^1 i+n\varepsilon_v^2 j}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}}{2^{i(m-\alpha)}2^{j(n-\beta)}}\frac{1}{2}A_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(v,w),\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\left\{2^{im\left(\frac{\varepsilon_w^1}{q}+\frac{\varepsilon_v^1}{p'}\right)}2^{jn\left(\frac{\varepsilon_w^2}{q}+\frac{\varepsilon_v^2}{p'}\right)}\right\}<2C^{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}\left\{2^{i(m-\alpha)}2^{j(n-\beta)}\right\}.$$

Thus we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}m\left(\frac{\varepsilon_w^1}{q}+\frac{\varepsilon_v^1}{p'}\right) &\leq m-\alpha=m(1-\eta) \text{ and } n\left(\frac{\varepsilon_w^2}{q}+\frac{\varepsilon_v^2}{p'}\right)\leq n-\beta=n(1-\eta);\\ \frac{\varepsilon_w^1}{q}+\frac{\varepsilon_v^1}{p'} &\leq 1-\eta \text{ and } \frac{\varepsilon_w^2}{q}+\frac{\varepsilon_v^2}{p'}\leq 1-\eta.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 8. *In the special case that $\frac{\alpha}{m}=\frac{\beta}{n}$ and $\varepsilon^1\equiv\varepsilon_w^1=\varepsilon_v^1$ and $\varepsilon^2\equiv\varepsilon_w^2=\varepsilon_v^2$ we thus have*

$$\varepsilon^1,\varepsilon^2\leq\frac{1-\eta}{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}},$$

where the fraction on the right hand side satisfies $\frac{1-\eta}{\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p'}}=\frac{1-\eta}{1-\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\right)}\leq 1$ since $\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}\leq\eta$, and where equality holds if and only if $\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}=\eta$.

We end this subsection by recalling a 1-parameter result from [SaWh]. We say that a weight μ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies a doubling condition with exponent $\varepsilon>0$ if

$$\frac{|RQ|_\mu}{|Q|_\mu}\leq CR^{\varepsilon n},\qquad \text{for all cubes } Q \text{ and } R>1.$$

Lemma 8. *Suppose that σ and ω are locally finite Borel measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$. If **either** σ has doubling exponent $0<\varepsilon<\left(1-\frac{\beta}{n}\right)p'$, **or** ω has doubling exponent $0<\varepsilon<\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{m}\right)q$, then*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega)\approx\mathbb{A}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}(\sigma,\omega).$$

This lemma extends to the product setting in the obvious way.

10.5. **The product fractional integral, the Dirac mass and a modified example.** Here we first consider both the two weight norm inequality (3.3) and the two-tailed characteristic (3.5) in the special case when $\sigma=\delta_{(0,0)}$, and show that they are equivalent in this case. Then we revisit Example to show that we can arrange for even the two-tailed characteristic to be finite when the operator norm is infinite. When $\sigma=\delta_{(0,0)}$ the two weight norm inequality (3.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right) &= \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} I_{\alpha,\beta}^{m,n}\delta_{(0,0)}(x,y)^q\ d\omega(x,y)\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\ &= \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(|x|^{\alpha-m}|y|^{\beta-n}\right)^q\ d\omega(x,y)\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}},\end{aligned}$$

and since $\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)\equiv\left(1+\frac{|x-c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{\alpha-m}\left(1+\frac{|y-c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\beta-n}$, (3.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right)\\ &= \sup_{I\times J\subset\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}|I|^{\frac{\alpha}{m}-1}|J|^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(x,y)^q\,d\omega(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\widehat{s}_{I\times J}(u,t)^{p'}\,d\delta_{(0,0)}(u,t)\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\ &= \sup_{I\times J\subset\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}|I|^{(\frac{\alpha}{m}-1)q}\left(1+\frac{|x-c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{(\alpha-m)q}|J|^{(\frac{\beta}{n}-1)q}\left(1+\frac{|y-c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{(\beta-n)q}d\omega(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\ &\qquad\times\left(1+\frac{|c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{\alpha-m}\left(1+\frac{|c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{\beta-n}\\ &= \sup_{I\times J\subset\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}\left(|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}+|x-c_I|\right)^{(\alpha-m)q}\left(1+\frac{|c_I|}{|I|^{\frac{1}{m}}}\right)^{(\alpha-m)q}\left(|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}+|y-c_J|\right)^{(\beta-n)q}\left(1+\frac{|c_J|}{|J|^{\frac{1}{n}}}\right)^{(\beta-n)q}d\omega(x,y)\right)\end{aligned}$$

If $I\times J$ has center $(c_I,c_J)=(0,0)$, then this supremum is equal to or greater than

$$\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^n}|x|^{(\alpha-m)q}|y|^{(\beta-n)q}\,d\omega(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}=\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right).$$

Thus from Lemma 3 we conclude that

$$\mathbb{N}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right)\approx\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,\beta),(m,n)}\left(\delta_{(0,0)},\omega\right).$$

Now we refine Example 1 given in the introduction.

Example 2. *Let $0<\alpha,\beta<1$ and $1<p,q<\infty$. Given $0<\rho<\infty$, define a weight pair $(\sigma_\rho,\omega_\rho)$ in the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ by*

$$\sigma_\rho\equiv\sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_\rho}\delta_{-P}\ \text{and}\ \omega_\rho\equiv\sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_\rho}\delta_P\qquad\text{where}\ \mathcal{P}_\rho=\left\{\left(2^k,2^{-\rho k}\right)\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}.$$

If $R = I \times J$ is a rectangle in the plane $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ with sides parallel to the axes that is symmetric about the origin $(0,0)$ and satisfies $R \cap \mathcal{P}_\rho = \left\{\left(2^N, 2^{-\rho N}\right)\right\}$ for some $N \geq 1$, then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\beta-1}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{s}_{I\times J})^{p'}\, d\sigma_{\rho,\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{s}_{I\times J})^{q}\, d\omega_{\rho,\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\lesssim \left(2^N\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{-\rho N}\right)^{\beta-1}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}}\left[\left(1+\frac{|x|}{2^N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(1+\frac{|y|}{2^{-\rho N}}\right)^{\beta-1}\right]^{p'} d\sigma_\rho(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\\
&\qquad\times\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}}\left[\left(1+\frac{|x|}{2^N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(1+\frac{|y|}{2^{-\rho N}}\right)^{\beta-1}\right]^{q} d\omega_\rho(x,y)\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we compute that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}}\left[\left(1+\frac{|x|}{2^N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(1+\frac{|y|}{2^{-\rho N}}\right)^{\beta-1}\right]^{q} d\omega_\rho(x,y)\\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left[\left(1+\frac{k^\mu 2^k}{2^N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(1+\frac{2^{-\rho k}}{2^{-\rho N}}\right)^{\beta-1}\right]^{q}\\
&\approx \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left[\left(2^{\rho(N-k)}\right)^{\beta-1}\right]^{q} + \sum_{k=N}^{\infty}\left[\left(2^{k-N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\right]^{q} = C,
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\beta-1}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{s}_{I\times J})^{p'}\, d\sigma_{\rho,\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{s}_{I\times J})^{q}\, d\omega_{\rho,\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \left(2^N\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{-\rho N}\right)^{\beta-1}$$

is uniformly bounded in N provided $\rho \leq \frac{1-\alpha}{1-\beta}$. More generally, suppose now that $R = I \times J$ is a rectangle in the plane $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ with sides parallel to the axes that is symmetric about the origin $(0,0)$ and satisfies $R \cap \mathcal{P}_\rho = \left\{\left(2^k, 2^{-\rho k}\right)\right\}_{k=L+1}^{L+N}$ for some $L \geq 0$ and $N \geq 1$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{s}_{I\times J})^{q}\, d\omega_{\rho,\mu} = \iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}}\left[\left(1+\frac{|x|}{2^{L+N}}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(1+\frac{|y|}{2^{-\rho(L+1)}}\right)^{\beta-1}\right]^{q} d\omega_{\rho,\mu}(x,y)\\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left[\left(1+\frac{2^k}{2^{L+N}}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(1+\frac{2^{-\rho k}}{2^{-\rho(L+1)}}\right)^{\beta-1}\right]^{q}\\
&\approx \sum_{k=1}^{L}\left[\left(2^{\rho(L-k)}\right)^{\beta-1}\right]^{q} + \sum_{k=L+1}^{L+N} 1^q + \sum_{k=L+N+1}^{\infty}\left[\left(2^{k-L-N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\right]^{q} \approx N,
\end{aligned}$$

and then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|I|^{\alpha-1}|J|^{\beta-1}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{s}_{I\times J})^{p'}\, d\sigma_{\rho,\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{s}_{I\times J})^{q}\, d\omega_{\rho,\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\lesssim \left(2^{L+N}\right)^{\alpha-1}\left(2^{-\rho(L+1)}\right)^{\beta-1} N^{\frac{1}{q}} N^{\frac{1}{p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This expression is uniformly bounded, and hence $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_{p,q}^{(\alpha,1),(\beta,1)}(\sigma_\rho,\omega_\rho)$ *is bounded, provided* $\rho \leq \frac{1-\alpha}{1-\beta}$. *On the other hand, the function* $f(x,y) \equiv c\left(\frac{1}{\log_2|x|}\right)$ *satisfies*

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} f^p d\sigma_\rho = c\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^p = 1,$$

hence $f \in L^p(\sigma_\rho)$ *with norm* 1 *provided* $p > 1$ *and* $c > 0$ *is chosen appropriately, while the strong dyadic fractional maximal function satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}(f\sigma_\rho)\left(2^N, 2^{-\rho N}\right) &\geq \left|\left(-2^N, 2^N\right)\right|^{\alpha-1}\left|\left(-2^{-\rho N}0, 2^{-\rho N}\right)\right|^{\beta-1}\iint_{[-2^N,2^N)\times[-2^{-\rho N},2^{-\rho N})} f d\sigma_\rho \\
&= 2^{N(\alpha-1-\rho(\beta-1))}(2)^{\alpha-1}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{1}{k} \\
&\geq c2^{N(\alpha-1-\rho(\beta-1))}(1+\ln N) \geq c > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $N \geq 1$ *provided*

$$\rho \geq \frac{1-\alpha}{1-\beta}.$$

Thus if $\rho = \frac{1-\alpha}{1-\beta}$, *even the* weak type *operator norm of the dyadic fractional maximal operator*$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}$ *is infinite since* $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mathrm{dy}}(f\sigma_\rho) > c > 0$ *on the set* $\mathcal{P}_\rho$ *of infinite* ω_ρ*-measure.*

References

[BeLo] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation spaces. An introduction.* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. **223**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976. x+207 pp.

[CoFe] R. R. Coifman and C. L. Fefferman, *Weighted norm inequalities for maximal functions and singular integrals,* Studia Math. **51** (1974), 241-250.

[CoRo] R. R. Coifman and R. R. Rochberg, *Another characteriztion of BMO*, Proc. A.M.S. **79** (1980), 249-254.

[Fef] R. Fefferman, *Multiparameter Fourier analysis,* Beijing Lectures in Harmonic Analysis **112** , Princeton Univ. Press (1986), 47-130.

[KoGa] M. Gabidzashvili and V. Kokilashvili, *Two weight weak type inequalities for fractional type integrals,* Ceskoslovenska Akademie Ved. **45** (1989), 1-11.

[LaMoPeTo] M. Lacey, K. Moen, C. Perez and R. Torres, *Sharp weighted bounds for fractional integral operators,* `arXiv:0905.3839v2` (2010).

[Maz] V. G. Maz'ja, Sobolev Spaces, Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg, 1985.

[MuWh] B. Muckenhoupt and R. L. Wheeden, *Weighted norm inequalities for fractional integrals.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **192 (**1974), 261-274.

[Saw] E. Sawyer, *A characterization of two weight norm inequalities for fractional and Poisson integrals*, Trans. A.M.S. **308** (1988), 533-545, MR{930072 (89d:26009)}.

[SaWh] E. Sawyer and R. L. Wheeden, *Weighted inequalities for fractional integrals on Euclidean and homogeneous spaces,* Amer. J. Math. **114** (1992), 813-874.

[Ste] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series **43**, Princeton U. Press, 1993.

[StWe1] E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, *Interpolation of operators with change of measures*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **87** (1958), 159-172.

[StWe2] E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, *Fractional integrals on n-dimensional space*, Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics **7** (1958), 503-514.

McMaster University

McMaster University